DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 748 JC 020 538

AUTHOR	Teasdale, Verna
TITLE	Community College Faculty Professional Development: Perspective in Time.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	375p.; D.A. Research Project, George Mason University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; Community Colleges; Educational History; Educational Practices; *Faculty Development; *Teacher Improvement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland

ABSTRACT

This case study explored how faculty professional development was handled at a community college over a period of 41 years. The exploration is from the perspective of the college's presidents, administrative staff, faculty representatives, Board of Trustees, and numerous state and regional associations. Perspectives were obtained primarily through personal interviews and a search of the college's archives. The study identifies four previously unreported, less obvious reasons why a community college offers faculty professional development: (1) it is an educational tradition or custom; (2) it provides social interaction; (3) it helps create and promote a proper image of the college; and (4) it meets the requirements of outside agencies. The study concludes that faculty professional development at a community college will lack constancy until the college culture values it as an on-going necessity and aligns faculty professional development goals and objectives with the college's mission. Appended is the list of college archive and administrator files. (Contains 72 references.) (Author/RC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 748

Community College Faculty Professional Development: Perspective in Time

A doctoral project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Arts in Community College Education at George Mason University.

By

Verna Teasdale
Bachelor of Arts
University of Washington, 1962
Master of Arts
University of Washington, 1966

Chairperson: Gilbert I. Coleman
James Monroe Center for Graduate and Professional Studies
Mary Washington College

Spring Semester 2001
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

JC020538

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Teasdale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: PERSPECTIVE IN TIME

by

Verna Teasdale
A Doctoral Project
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Arts in Community College Education

Committee:

Gilbert I. Coleman Chairperson
Dr. Gilbert I. Coleman

R M Swartwood
Dr. Rose Mary Swartwood

Gustavo A. Mellander
Dr. Gustavo A. Mellander

Gustavo A. Mellander Director, National Center for
Dr. Gustavo A. Mellander Community College Education

Date: March 21, 2001

Spring Semester 2001
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

DEDICATION

This doctoral project is dedicated to the men and women who were constant encouragers, and steadfast in their assurance that this project would be completed. Among those supporters were my committee chairman, Dr. Gilbert I. Coleman; the members of the Professional Development Team, Alan Mickelson and Mary Stevenson; prayer warriors who understand that only by the grace of God can anything be accomplished; and my husband, Dr. John Teasdale, whose patience and love sustained our marriage through the doctoral process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the total cooperation of the administration, faculty, and library staff of the Community College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
List of Tables viii
Abstract ix

Chapter I: Introduction 1
    Responsibility Placed on Faculty 2
    Little Incentive for Faculty to Professionally Develop 3
    Need for Faculty Professional Development Recognized 5
    Faculty Professional Development Efforts Ineffective 7
    Faculty Professional Development Should Address Significant Changes 8
    Faculty Professional Development Programs Lack Constancy 11
    A Study of Faculty Professional Development Constancy Needed 12
    Case Study Method Best Suited to Study 13
    The Problem 13
    Research Questions 15
    Organization of the Study 15

Chapter II: Literature Review 17
    Faculty Professional Development Studies and Reports from the 1960s and 1970s 19
    Miller and Wilson (1963) 19
    Soffen (1967) 23
    Singer (1969) 27
    Chronister (1970) 29
    O'Banion (1972) 30
    Freedman, with Brown, Ralph, Shukraft, Bloom, and Sanford (1979) 33
    Faculty Professional Development Studies and Reports from the 1980s 38
    Heelan (1980) 38
    O'Banion (1981) 40
    McCright (1983) 43
    Shawl (1984) 46
    Harnish (1986) 48
    Miller and Ratcliff (1986) 53
    Nickel (1986) 54
    Smith and Schwartz (1986) 56

Sorcinelli (1986) 57
Valek (1986) 59
Florida State Board of Community Colleges (1987) 61
Richardson and Moore (1987) 62
Katz and Henry (1988) 65
Giroux (1989) 67
Faculty Professional Development Studies and Reports from the 1990s 67
Focus on Access, Community, and Excellence in Teaching (FACET) Commission (1990) 67
Schuster, Wheeler and Associates (1990) 69
Clough (1991) 71
Engleberg (1991) 75
Fideler (1991) 78
Hoerner, Clowes, Lichtman and Allkins (1991) 79
Monoson and Batsche (1992) 82
Texas Consortium of Geriatric Education Centers (1992) 84
Gappa and Leslie (1993) 85
Angelo (1994) 88
Howey and Zimpher (1994) 91
Oromaner (1994) 94
Felton and Whitton (1996) 95
Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995) 96
Thompson (1995) 98
Sablan (1996) 100
Johnson County Community College (1996) 102
Summary 104

Chapter III: Case Study Methodology 106
Collecting the Data 109
Selected Administrators and Faculty 109
Professional Development Team 113
College Archives 115
Faculty Surveys and Focus Groups 116
Examining the Data 116
Defining Faculty Professional Development 118
Institution-Centered Definitions of Faculty Professional Development 119
Faculty-Oriented Definitions of Faculty Professional Development 120
Determining the Purpose of Faculty Professional Development 123
Berquist and Phillips (1977/1979) Three Element Model 124
Berquist and Phillips (1977/1979) Four Element Model 124
Gaff (1975, as cited in Monoson and Batsche, 1992) Single Element Model 125
Instructional development 126
Institutional development 127

Personal development 128
Composite model (with multiple elements) 130
Study Protocol 133

Chapter IV: Stakeholders' Perspectives 135
Timeline of Important Events in the History of the College 136
Order of Presentation of Stakeholders' Perspectives 138
Presidents' Perspectives 139
President #1 (1958-1964) 140
President #2 (Acting President) (1964-1965) 156
President #3 (1965-1967) 160
President #4 (1967-1971) 163
President #5 (1971-1972) 168
President #6 (1972-1999) 174
Summary: Presidents' Perspectives 179
Administrators' and Administrative Staff Members' Perspectives 180
Dean of Arts and Sciences 181
Administrative Assistant to the President 182
Dean of Instruction/Vice President for Instruction 186
Assistants to the Vice President for Instruction 192
Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs 197
Staff Development and Cross Cultural Coordinator 206
Vice President for Instruction 209
Summary: Administrators' and Administrative Staff Members' Perspectives... 219
Faculty's Perspectives 221
Earning a Doctorate 221
Creating Programs 224
Faculty member who established Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Reasoning Across the Curriculum (RAC) 224
Faculty member who introduced women's studies to the campus 228
Surveys and Focus Groups 231
1967 Survey 232
1971 Survey 233
1987 Survey 234
1995 Survey 239
1998 Paper and Pencil Survey 241
1998 Focus Groups 244
Summary: Faculty's Perspectives 249
Faculty Representatives 250
Faculty Council/Faculty Welfare Committee 251
Faculty Senate 256
College Senate 259
College Senate and President #4 262
College Senate and President #5 265

College Senate and President #6 271
Faculty Organization 275
Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee 283
Professional Development Council 288
Summary: Faculty Representatives' Perspectives 290
Outside Stakeholders' Perspectives 291
Board of Trustees 291
Summary: Board of Trustees' Perspective 297
Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools 297
Summary: Perspective of Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools 315
Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), and Maryland Association of Community Colleges (MACC) 316
Summary: Perspectives of Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), and Maryland Association of Community Colleges (MACC) 322
Technology Perspective 323
Summary: Technology 326
Chapter Summary 326

Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusions 328
Study Supported Claims in the Literature 330
Traditional Reasons Given for Why Community Colleges Offer Faculty Professional Development 331
Other Reasons Why Community Colleges Offer Faculty Professional Development 332
Faculty Professional Development is an Educational Tradition or Custom 333
Faculty Professional Development is a Social Occasion 334
Faculty Professional Development Helps to Create or to Promote an Image 336
Faculty Professional Development Meets the Requirements of Outside Agencies 336
Answers to Research Questions 337
Research Question 1 338
Research Question 2 339
Research Question 3 340
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award 1998 Criteria for Performance Excellence 342
Recommendations for Additional Research 343
Final Thoughts 344

Appendix 345
References 356

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Administrators and Faculty Members Interviewed ... 112
2. Funds Allocated and Funds Expended for Professional Development-Related Budget Objects in the General Current Operating Budgets for FY72 and FY73 ... 172
3. Administrators and Administrative Staff Members in charge of Faculty Professional Development During the Term of President #6 ... 181
4. 1967 Survey Categories that "Needed Attention" According to Faculty: 67 responses rank ordered by percent of faculty selecting category ... 232
5. Top Five Professional Development Areas Faculty Planned to Emphasize in the Two Years Following the 1998 Paper and Pencil Survey ... 242
6. Mean Average of Items in Promoting Professional Development for the Entire Faculty in Response to the 1998 Paper and Pencil Survey ... 243

ABSTRACT

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: PERSPECTIVE IN TIME

Verna Teasdale, D.A.
George Mason University, 2001

Doctoral Project Chairperson: Dr. Gilbert Coleman

Even though the importance of community college faculty professional development is readily accepted, and community colleges are credited with always having offered faculty professional development (Cohen & Brawer, 1996), nevertheless professional development often has lacked constancy. The few exemplary community college faculty professional development programs are usually presented with the caveat that they may have been changed since they were reported (O'Banion, 1981; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Increasing and varied demands placed on community college faculty underscore the need for professional development. Community college faculty must understand how to teach and appreciate a diverse student body, stay current in their disciplines, and use state-of-the-art technology.

This case study explores how faculty professional development was handled at a community college over a period of 41 years. The exploration is from the perspectives of

the college's presidents, administrators, administrative staff, faculty, faculty representatives, Board of Trustees, Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Maryland Higher Education Commission, and the Maryland Association of Community Colleges. The perspectives were obtained primarily through personal interviews and an exhaustive search of the college's archives.

The study identifies four previously unreported, less obvious reasons why a community college offers faculty professional development. These reasons can contribute to the lack of constancy in faculty professional development. The four less obvious reasons for a community college to offer faculty professional development are because faculty professional development:

- is an educational tradition or custom
- provides a social occasion
- helps to create and to promote a proper image of the college
- meets the requirements of outside agencies.

When the Malcolm Baldrige 1998 Criteria for Performance Excellence were applied to the findings, community college faculty professional development fell short.

The study concludes that faculty professional development at a community college will lack constancy until the college culture values it as an on-going necessity and aligns faculty professional development goals and objectives with the college's mission.

Chapter I: Introduction

The community college has become the nation's panacea in higher education. National education policy identifies the community college as the means to satisfy whatever educational needs arise beyond high school that are not met by four-year schools. This role was established in 1947, when the President's Commission on Higher Education, popularly known as the Truman Commission, "made the community college a keystone of national education policy" (Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck, & Suppiger, 1995, p. 132).

The role of the community college has expanded and become even more important in the education spectrum. In his 1997 State of the Union address, President Clinton issued a ten-point "Call to Action for American Education in the 21st Century" that included making "the 13th and 14th years of education as universal as high school" (p. 2). In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education declared, "Community colleges are very much a part of the solution to all of the education challenges that face this nation . . . . These two year colleges truly represent the community's interests in postsecondary education" (p. 2).

The education needs and challenges facing the United States are substantial. They include eradicating welfare (U.S. Department of Education, 1998), training a large segment of our citizens to compete internationally (Focus on Access, Community, and

Excellence in Teaching Commission [FACET Commission], 1990) and "meeting America's technological, economic, social and political needs," (FACET Commission, 1990, p. III).

Expectations are high. Much is being asked of the community college. Terrel Bell, former Secretary of Education, characterized the enormity of the community college's task to meet the national educational needs and challenges as both a "vital responsibility" and a "burden," (FACET Commission, 1990, p. III).

Responsibility Placed on Faculty

In reality, the "vital responsibility" and the "burden" fall not to the community college as an institution. The "vital responsibility" and "burden" fall to the *teachers in the community college*. "Now, more than ever, community college faculty will be called upon to creatively maximize educational resources" (U.S. Department of Education, 1998, p. 2).

The demands placed on the community college faculty to meet the expectations are broad and conflicting. In the words of the U.S. Department of Education:

> It will be up to the faculty to develop and to implement the welfare to work curriculum. And it will require a talented faculty to simultaneously provide young and adult learners alike with high academic and high-skill vocational courses that they will need to succeed. (1998, p. 1)

Additionally, faculty determine the reputation of the college. "The college or university can recognize that, if it aspires to greatness itself, its only means to attain it is in a faculty made up of individual teachers, each striving in his teaching" (Bergquist & Phillips, 1981, p. 337).

The high expectations automatically assume that community college teachers can meet the demands. Whether or not they can live up to the expectations is an issue. The ability of community college teachers to "creatively maximize educational resources" across such a wide spectrum of educational demands requires that they continuously advance in their knowledge of their disciplines and that they continuously improve their teaching ability. Community college faculties need continuous professional development.

Little Incentive for Faculty to Professionally Develop

Aside from tenure and promotion requirements, intrinsic satisfaction, or licensing requirements in some professional disciplines, community college faculty members appear to have little incentive to develop either in their disciplines or in their teaching skills. Community college teachers may be required to meet certain professional development standards for tenure, promotion, and periodic evaluations, but most are not subject to the professional development required of teachers in either four-year institutions of higher education or public school systems.

Four-year colleges and universities emphasize faculty members' involvement in research and scholarship (Chickering & Associates, 1981). Achieving tenure and promotions in these institutions usually requires evidence of research and scholarship.

Public school systems are required by state law to have certified teachers. For example, public school teachers in the State of Maryland must meet standards of "scholarship, executive ability, personality, and teaching efficiency" (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland: Education, 1989, p. 145). Periodically public school teachers in Maryland must renew their certification by taking workshops or courses approved by the Maryland State Board of Education (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland: Education, p. 38).

Community college teachers are not usually subject to the professional development requirements of either four-year colleges and universities or of public schools. Whereas four-year colleges and universities emphasize research and scholarship over teaching (Chickering & Associates, 1981), community colleges emphasize teaching over research and scholarship (London, 1989). Public schools also emphasize teaching; however, public school systems require teachers to take courses in teaching methods as a condition for employment, and to upgrade their skills as a condition for renewing their teaching certificates. Community colleges are neither required to hire certified teachers, nor are the teachers that they hire required to take courses in teaching as a prerequisite for employment, for tenure, or for promotion. With the exception of a few professional disciplines such as nursing, which must meet professional accreditation standards, once community college teachers become tenured full professors there is little extrinsic pressure that can compel them to continuously upgrade either their teaching skills or knowledge of their disciplines. Bergquist and Phillips (1981) state in their third professional handbook that they wrote their first professional handbook on the assumption "that faculty often have been unable or unwilling to plan effectively for their own development and generally have not taken advantage of excellent professional development opportunities" (p. 11).

Need for Faculty Professional Development Recognized

While some faculty and administrators have dismissed faculty development as unnecessary or duplicative (Bergquist & Phillips, 1981), others have acknowledged the importance of faculty professional development and, early on, lamented the lack of it:

> College teaching is the only major learned profession for which there does not exist a well-defined program of preparation directed toward developing the skills which it is essential for the practitioner to possess. (The President's Commission on Higher Education, as cited in Soffen, 1967, p. 29)

The need for faculty professional development[1] began receiving extensive attention in the 1960s and 70s (Miller & Wilson, 1963; O'Banion, 1972; Menges & Mathis, 1988). Colleges began to realize that the "problems of faculty development are part of . . . the problem of *institutional development,*" (Miller & Wilson, 1963, p. 5). As such, they realized that the success of the college, in part, depends on the ability of the teachers to stay current in their disciplines, teach a diversified student body, and use state-of-the art technology.

---

[1] The terms *professional development*, *faculty professional development*, and *faculty development* are used interchangeably.

Cohen and Brawer (1996) maintained that faculty professional development has always been part of the community college scene. They explained that the need for professional development was intensified when the accelerated growth of community colleges ended. Because colleges could no longer hire new faculty to handle new functions they were required to rely on existing faculty to handle new priorities. According to Cohen and Brawer, "When the rate of change exceeded the rate of expansion, when new priorities were enunciated more rapidly than new funds could be found, the residue of out-of-phase staff members increased—hence the calls for staff development" (1996, p. 81).

O'Banion (1972) sounded an early call for community colleges to provide faculty professional development:

> Particularly critical is the matter of training new community-junior college . . . teachers with the understandings and competencies which will enable them to work effectively with a diversified, comprehensive community-junior college. Of no less concern is the assisting of personnel already at work in community-junior college . . . . (p. 2)

O'Banion criticized community-junior college preservice programs as inadequate, and called for in-service programs that would "upgrade and retool their [community-junior college staff's] skills, attitudes, and knowledge" (1972, p. 102).

During the 1970s, community college administrations began to acknowledge that "the quality of education in the community college depended primarily on the quality of the staff" (O'Banion, 1981, p. 2). Community college administrators determined that "the faculty's greatest general need was for more preparation in education, curriculum and learning" (O'Banion, 1981, p. 58).

Faculty Professional Development Efforts Ineffective

While O'Banion acknowledged the existence of professional development activities in community colleges, he also criticized them, pointing out that

> few [community colleges] had staff development programs in the sense of an organized, purposeful, supported attempt to provide for the professional and personal growth of all staff . . . . Most colleges . . . had little idea of the range of their staff development activities. Fewer colleges still had developed a rationale for staff development programs. (1981, p. 3)

College professors in the 1970s criticized faculty professional development efforts from a different perspective. They complained that the institutions simply did not understand the full dimension and human potential of their faculties. As a result they complained that "most programs of *faculty development* . . . designed to help professors become more effective in their present professional roles . . . foster narrow outlooks and impair the realization of human potentialities" (Freedman, 1979, p. vi). Freedman sympathized with the professors, suggesting that:

> [the] narrow conception of faculty and their activities have probably been the chief barrier to improved education and teaching . . . . Faculty development programs designed to reward good teaching, render assistance to poor teachers or

> train good teachers will surely founder unless they are based on [an] understanding of faculty members. (1979, p. viii)

Freedman believed that colleges were not giving adequate attention to the needs of their faculties. After interviewing over 700 randomly selected professors on a variety of campuses, including community colleges, Freedman concluded, "Academic institutions must be as concerned with the development of their faculty as with the development of their students and must provide educational opportunities for faculty . . . ." (1979, p. vi)

Faculty Professional Development Should Address Significant Changes

By the 1980s, colleges were credited with being more attentive to faculty development; however, the substance of the programs was criticized. Schuster, Wheeler, and Associates (1990) rejected the programs as "almost always too narrowly conceived and even more narrowly implemented" (p. 6). They explained that "a 'mature' program to enhance professional and personal development must exist above all as an integrated, systematic program" (p. 6).

During the 1980s and 1990s, four significant changes emerged on college campuses that needed to be addressed through faculty professional development. One was the increased diversity of students and their lack of preparedness for college. Second was the flood of new technology. Third was the increase in the number of part-time or adjunct faculty[2] members. Fourth was the flood of knowledge and new information that inundated nearly every discipline.

---

[2] The terms *part-time* and *adjunct faculty* are used interchangeably.

In a postscript to the FACET Report (1990), Roueche forecast that the increasingly diverse and heterogeneous student body will provide "an even greater challenge to faculty . . . in the days ahead," (FACET Commission, 1990, p. 19). The challenge to both full-time and part-time faculty is to have a range of teaching methods that address a variety of learning styles. Faculty must find ways to reach the increasing numbers of poorly prepared students who are entering the college (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Bushnell (as cited in London, 1989) said "the responsibility for educating a mixture of low achieving or under-achieving students and more able students falls squarely on the shoulders of the faculty" (p. 249).

In addition to finding ways to reach diverse students, faculty also had to become technologically savvy. Henderson, Neibling, and Degner explained that technology in the classroom is transforming the traditional lecture-and-listen technique "to a more dynamic interactive process" (1996, p. 4). Technology such as computers, projector computers, CD-ROMs, the Internet, distance learning facilities, on-line courses, and e-mail are rapidly changing the education delivery system. Technology shifted the role of the instructor from being only the sage-on-the-stage, to being the guide-at-the-side as well.

The third significant change has been the substantial number of part-time faculty hired either to replace retiring full-time faculty, or to teach classes created by expanding enrollments in the late 1990s. According to Cohen and Brawer (1996) over 50% of the instructors at community colleges are part-time, rising from 34% in 1968 to 53% in 1992 (p. 86). Even with the significant increase in part-time faculty members, Gappa and Leslie pointed out that colleges, in general, have not considered providing professional development for part-time faculty a high priority even though they "now carry a significant part of the responsibility for teaching, especially at the lower-division level of undergraduate education," (1993, p. 12). Adjunct faculty tend to be "invisible" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993); they come to campus, teach, and leave. Most do not know many of the full-time faculty. Frequently, they do not receive the same information that full-time faculty receive (Hoerner, Clowes, Lichtman, and Allkins, 1991). Colleges wrongly may assume that part-time faculty do not need professional development because many are practitioners of the subject that they teach, but Gappa and Leslie pointed out "they [part-time faculty] need to be supported in their efforts to offer good instruction" (1993, p. 12). Gappa and Leslie favored professional development programs that "involve continuing efforts to help part-time faculty shape their teaching to the needs and goals of the institution and focus on achieving the learning outcomes considered important" (1992, p. 204). Unless colleges provide such programs, adjunct faculty may have no other access to programs that will upgrade their teaching skills.

With new information and knowledge flooding nearly every discipline, unless faculty members stay current, what they know becomes rapidly outdated. Nickel (1986) estimated that content knowledge has a half-life of 6-7 years. The Florida State Board of Community Colleges (1987) bluntly stated, "Teachers cannot remain stimulating without continuing to learn . . . . When teachers stop learning, they begin to repeat themselves and eventually lose touch with their students and their environment" (p. 17). Cohen and Brawer recognized the problem of knowledge erosion as common to community college faculty. They explained, "For most faculty members, the longer they are at the college, the weaker their affiliation with their academic discipline becomes," (1996, p. 96).

Faculty Professional Development Programs Lack Constancy

Community colleges have been criticized for their lack of constancy in providing faculty professional development programs (O'Banion, 1981; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The colleges offered no assurance that professional development programs would be a constant on the campus or what form they would take. Even when O'Banion highlighted the professional development programs of six community colleges which he considered exemplary, he cautioned that "these programs are in a state of change, and with the lapse in time . . . activities reported here may have been dropped or modified" (1981, p. v). Katz and Henry (1988) identified the same problem when they complained that "efforts at faculty development usually were short-term and episodic" (p. x). As a result, they reasoned, the programs did not have "the transforming influence upon teaching and learning that many had expected," (p. x). Constancy continues to be a problem. Gappa and Leslie (1993) cautioned:

> Readers should also be aware that we have reported what we found during our visits at our site institutions during the 1990-91 academic year. Programs and ideas attributed to institutions were those that were in place at the time of our visits. Since that time, people and programs may have come and gone, and we do not wish to suggest that the same programs are necessarily still in place. (pp. 10-11)

A Study of Faculty Professional Development Constancy Needed

The increasing demands placed on community colleges and, by default, on community college faculty (Witt et al., 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 1998; FACET Commission, 1990) emphasize the critical need for community colleges to provide programs of continuous professional development that equip faculty to meet the demands. Unfortunately, faculty professional development at community colleges often has not been continuous. The lack of constancy in faculty professional development at many community colleges is serious and has been criticized (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Katz & Henry, 1988; O'Banion, 1981; Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987).

The lack of constancy in faculty professional is a problem with significant consequences. In 1963, Miller and Wilson clearly articulated the consequences:

> It is a matter of obvious concern that conditions conducive to the continuous professional growth and development of college teachers be fostered on every campus since under any set of circumstances the quality of education that students receive will be influenced by the quality of college faculties. (p. 1)

Thirty-one years later, in 1994, Howey voiced a similar concern, citing "lack of attention to our *continuing professional development* [italics added]" as a major cause for "why the abilities and endeavors of many teacher educators are less than they should be" (Howey & Zimpher, pp. 15-16). For over 30 years the lack of constancy in faculty profession development has been criticized, and the call for constancy has been made; yet little has been done to determine why faculty professional development has lacked constancy. If the reasons for the lack of constancy in community college faculty professional development can be determined, then community colleges can use the information to assess their approach to faculty professional development and make necessary adjustments. An examination of faculty professional development at a community college is long overdue.

Case Study Method Best Suited to Study

An investigation of faculty professional development at a community college must examine *how* professional development has been handled to determine *why* it has lacked constancy. Such an examination lends itself to the research methodology of a case study. Researchers Marshall & Rossman (1995), Stake (1995) and Yin (1994) have endorsed the case study as a research strategy particularly suited to answer "how" and "why" questions. Yin (1994) supported the case study as a means "to *explain* the causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies" (1994, p. 15). The details of using the case study, including the advantages and disadvantages, are discussed in Chapter III.

The Problem

The constantly changing landscape of the community college, which includes a more diversified, under-prepared student body (London, 1989; FACET Commission, 1990; Cohen & Brawer, 1996); an increase in technology (Henderson et al., 1996); large numbers of adjunct faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Gappa & Leslie, 1993) and a flood of new information (Nickel, 1986; Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987), support both the need for and importance of faculty professional development programs. Even so, in some ways faculty professional development at a community college is an enigma. Neither the definition nor the purpose of faculty professional development is settled. Equally unsettled is what the content of community college faculty professional development should be and who should be responsible for it (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The unsettled definition and purpose of faculty professional development programs are indicative of another problem: lack of constancy, which has been cited by O'Banion (1981), Katz & Henry (1988), and Gappa & Leslie (1993). Lack of constancy in faculty professional development means that a community college offers no assurance as to the frequency or content of professional development programs.

The literature, which is filled with discussions, criticisms, descriptions, and surveys of professional development programs (O'Banion, 1972, 1981; Katz & Henry, 1988; Freedman, 1979; Schuster et al., 1990; Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987; Hoerner et al., 1991), offers little help in explaining *why* community college faculty professional development lacks constancy. Typically the studies offer only an episodic view or snapshot of community college faculty professional development. Such views are limited in time, therefore they cannot address the lack of constancy in faculty professional development that may emerge over time. Missing from the literature, then, is a study with a longitudinal perspective that examines how a community college handles faculty professional development over a period of many years. Therefore, using the case study method, this study examines how a community college has handled faculty professional development over the lifetime of the college to determine the possible causes for a lack of constancy in its professional development program.

Research Questions

For this case study to determine the possible causes for the lack of constancy in community college faculty professional development, the study must answer the following questions:

1. What major forces have shaped faculty professional development at the community college over time?
2. How has the college planned and implemented professional development over time?
3. Over the lifetime of the college, how responsive have professional development plans been to the needs and interests of the faculty?

The case study strategy coupled with the longitudinal perspective of a 41-year time frame should provide the answers to the questions and, in so doing, explain why faculty professional development at a community college lacks constancy.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has introduced the importance of professional development for community college faculty, and has identified the problem as a lack of constancy that apparently plagues community college professional development. A case study that examines how professional development has been handled over the lifetime of a community college was proposed. The intent of the study was to determine possible causes of the lack of constancy in community college faculty professional development.

Chapter II reviews relevant literature on professional development in search of information that contributes to an understanding of why the lack of constancy in community college faculty professional development has been a problem. The review of professional development literature spans four decades: from 1963 to 1999.

Chapter III details the case study methodology used in this research. Additionally, it discusses both the definitions and purposes of faculty professional development. The chapter concludes with the protocol used for the study.

Chapter IV chronicles faculty professional development in the life of the community college from the perspectives of college stakeholders who, in one capacity or another, were involved with it. These individuals include top college administrators, their assistants, faculty, and influential groups from outside the college.

Chapter V analyzes the data obtained from all sources. Based on the results of the analysis, some conclusions are drawn about why community college faculty professional development has lacked constancy. Community college faculty professional development is then compared with the expectations of faculty development as specified by the Malcom Baldrige 1998 criteria for performance excellence. The Baldrige criteria are a nationally accepted self-assessment that were developed first for business, and later adapted for education. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further study and final thoughts.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Though Cohen & Brawer (1996) credited community colleges with always having faculty professional development, the community colleges' interest in faculty professional development was not fully awakened until the accelerated growth of community colleges ended and the colleges had to develop existing faculty to handle new priorities. One result of the interest in faculty professional development has been a proliferation of professional development literature. A library search yields 600-700 items and an Internet search will yield over 10,000 hits, most of which provide either prescriptive or descriptive information about faculty professional development.

The comparatively few professional development studies are typically conducted as case studies or surveys. No study was found that addressed the lack of constancy in community college faculty professional development per se; however, some findings either allude to or discuss the lack of constancy (O'Banion, 1981; Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987; Katz & Henry, 1988; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). When O'Banion (1981) highlighted model professional development programs, he cautioned, "These programs are in a state of change, and with the lapse in time . . . activities reported here may have been dropped or modified" (p. v). Gappa and Leslie (1993) said that the programs they reported were in place during their visits to some community colleges, but "since that time, people and programs may have come and gone, and we do not wish to suggest that the same programs are necessarily still in place" (pp. 10-11). The Florida State Board of Community Colleges (1987) observed "Although intentions have been good, in-service programs are frequently quite piecemeal" (p. 21). Katz and Henry used the terms "short-term and episodic" (1988, p. x)–which is another way of saying lack of constancy–to explain the ineffectiveness of faculty development in the 1970s. Calling faculty professional development piecemeal (Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987), or short-term and episodic (Katz & Henry, 1988) is not an explanation for the inconstancy of faculty professional development. Furthermore, attributing the lack of constancy in faculty professional development to time and people (O'Banion, 1981; Gappa & Leslie, 1993) is an inadequate explanation because it does not explain how or why time and people cause the inconstancy. The question remains: why have faculty professional development programs lacked constancy?

This study spans faculty professional development at a community college from 1958 to 1999; to the extent possible, the literature review covers a comparable period of time. The literature review is divided into three time frames: 1960s and 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Each document, identified by author and date of publication, was included in this review because in some way it contributes to understanding why faculty professional development programs have lacked constancy.

Faculty Professional Development Studies and Reports from the 1960s and 1970s

Prior to 1966, formal information about faculty professional development was limited. Cardozo, executive director of the Association of American Law Schools discussed the limitation in a letter that he wrote in 1966:

> "Faculty development is a major concern . . . but there have been very few formal programs on the subject. There will probably be more in the future. A good deal of attention has been given . . . by some people, but not very much in a formal way." (as cited in Soffen, 1967, pp. xv-xvi)

Miller and Wilson (1963)

Miller and Wilson (1963) conducted an early faculty professional development study that yielded insightful information that is still useful. They surveyed 228 four-year southern colleges with enrollments of fewer than 2,000 students to find out:

> what small colleges of the Southern [sic] region [were] doing to promote faculty orientation and in-service development . . . as reflected by the presence of selected institutional provisions, practices, or policies . . . designed to a) help orient new faculty members to the institution and encourage the identification of faculty members, new and old, with institutional problems and purposes, b) provide incentive and opportunity for improvement of faculty members in teaching effectiveness and for professional growth generally, and c) contribute to faculty security and morale. (p. 7)

From their analysis of 214 completed questionnaires, Miller and Wilson drew a number of important conclusions:

- "there is a dearth of well-articulated, comprehensively designed *programs* for development characterized by a distinctive philosophy and projection of institutional concern for a process of faculty orientation and development from 'selection' to 'separation'" (p. 27).
- "faculty members tended to attach greater importance to some [professional development] practices than did administrators" (p. 28).
- "the existence of particular patterns of faculty development procedures in a college appears to be related to the special interests and concerns of administrators" (p.72).
- "almost by definition faculty development procedures exist because administrators have reasons for instituting them" (p. 72).
- "evidence that the extent and nature of institutional procedures for development are related to administrative concern was found in colleges where the president, the dean or both, were new or were in the process of leaving." In these cases, "some administratively supported procedures were in process of change and some which had not existed were being instituted although the resources of the colleges remained constant" (pp. 72-73).
- "the success of any program for faculty development–or of any facet of such a program–depends in large measure upon the ability of administrators to relate

procedures employed to the current needs and aspirations of faculty members" (p. 73).

- "administrative concern . . . springs–in theory–directly from identification with the institution as a whole and is motivated by a desire to improve the college–to meet institutional needs." Furthermore, "Not all faculty members . . . can be said to share this same pattern of identification and motivation" (p.73).
- "faculty members . . . want to know that the administration has an interest in their work that grows from an understanding of the educational process and the key role of the faculty in that process" (p. 73).

Based on the results of the survey, Miller and Wilson recommended a general course of actions "to make 'faculty development' a meaningful concept on every campus" (p. 76). These actions included first, having college presidents allocate to "the dean the responsibility, time and resources required for effective leadership in faculty development" (pp. 76-77). Miller and Wilson emphasized that providing effective administrative leadership was "a necessary condition for improvement" (p. 77) of faculty professional development. Second, Miller and Wilson suggested that

> each institution could profitably examine and assess its current efforts [by asking]:
>
> 1. Is there, on this campus, a generally understood concept of the "process" of faculty development and of the institution's responsibilities in respect to fostering conditions conducive to in-service growth and development?

2. Are major goals and objectives clearly formulated in operational terms?
3. Are major problems in respect to faculty development reasonably clearly defined and understood by both faculty and administration?
4. Is there a long-range plan for dealing with problems of faculty recruitment, retention, promotion, and in-service growth? (p. 77)

Based on their findings, Miller and Wilson stressed "the need for more systematically and comprehensively designed programs for development," (p. 77). Further, they warned that "institutions which do not attempt to anticipate the future realistically and develop their [faculty professional development] plans accordingly may well suffer serious consequences, particularly if they start from a somewhat unfavorable competitive position" (p. 77). Miller and Wilson extended the need for individual faculty members to make long range professional development plans, noting that "faculty members should be encouraged to project their long-range plans for improvement, with the faculty member identifying his own goals and needs and the college attempting to relate them to college projections and goals" (p. 77).

Even though small four-year southern colleges were the subjects of the survey, the findings are applicable to community colleges for two reasons. First, Miller and Wilson generalized the implications of their study to all institutions, saying "[The] implications for all institutions . . . is that some responsibility for orienting and 'instructing' the newly inducted practitioner to the teaching profession must be assumed by the employing institution" (p. 3). Second, the study is applicable because of the similarities between the four-year college teachers and community college teachers.

According to Miller and Wilson "college teachers typically enter their profession with little special 'preservice' preparation for the assumption of faculty responsibilities, including classroom teaching, and many fail to develop identification with teaching or with the institution after joining a college faculty" (p. 3). Miller and Wilson's description of college teachers closely resembles London's 1989 discussion of community college teachers.

This study is particularly interesting because it has stood the test of time. Subsequent studies included in this literature review report similar findings.

Soffen (1967)

In 1965 the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) initiated a study which would result in the development of "proposals for sound and realistic . . . preservice preparation, . . . and continue[d] education of faculty" (p. xi). To collect data for the study, an Advisory Committee used a range of strategies including three surveys, two workshops, and a literature review which resulted in an extensive set of findings, some of which are highlighted here:

- "There must be clarity about the kind of teacher to be developed in order to give direction to a program of faculty development. What are the demands of his total range of responsibilities? What should he know and what should he be able to do?" (p. 49).
- Guiding principles for faculty development must be reality-based starting with a specific "number of essential criteria . . . . If essentials are specified,

alternatives by which these essentials may be satisfied, and what is and what is not interchangeable, can be approached deliberately" (p. 77).

- Use both *long term and short term approaches* to faculty development. "No matter how promising a set of proposals for achieving an objective, and regardless of the enthusiasm with which they are undertaken, complex problems are not solved overnight" (p.77). Until the longer term goals can be attained, "recognize [faculty's] immediate urgencies and provide for them" (p. 77).
- New faculty identified problems that fall into three broad categories:
    1. transition (i.e. the socialization of all new faculty) into the college
    2. clarification and learning of new roles: Soffen identifies transition or socialization of faculty, and faculty learning new roles, as universal problems (p. 114).
    3. teaching function: Soffen notes that "the teaching component is lacking in the preparation of most new faculty and even those who have had post master's education" (p. 114).
- "Typical practices [of inducting new faculty] focus upon familiarization with immediate curricular activities; some with role identification, a few with socialization to the school" (p. 123).
- "Socialization to the university appears to be generally neglected and is not accomplished by formal introductions to university officials or receptions by the president" (p. 127).

- "Without an adequate orientation to the requirements of a specific teaching job and its relation to the programs of the college and to the overall aims and objectives of the institution," Thompson stated, "an individual faculty member cannot satisfactorily fulfill his proper role" (as cited in Soffen, p. 125).
- "Induction of new faculty in a school will have an impact on 'old' faculty, and induction programs must be seen within the context of the climate and style for continuing learning of the total faculty" (p. 123).
- "It is proposed that faculty development be identified as a discreet and explicit administrative responsibility, assigned to an individual in the same formal manner in which other responsibilities are assigned" (p. 124). Furthermore, "The person who accepts this responsibility, whether it be the dean or another faculty member, must be . . . committed to the process, and have the specialized skills for giving leadership to an active program which embraces the whole faculty" (p. 125).
- "Faculty development is appropriately seen as a process which surely does not terminate at the end of an induction period." Instead, "individual creativity *and* the collective strength of a faculty body can be expected to flourish only by continuing investment in building upon the strengths which the individuals bring" (p. 129).
- "The responsibility of administration and responsibility of individuals for their *self-development* are not mutually exclusive:

> Since 90 percent of all learning is self-learning . . . the most effective and the most meaningful development is self-development. Many of us need some external stimulus . . . . This role can best be filled by our colleagues, the department chairman, the supervisor of instruction, the dean, or a combination of these professional associates" (Thompson, as cited in Soffen, 1967, p. 136).

Soffen quotes from Tschudin's paper "The Administrator's Responsibility for Continuing Education of Nurse Faculty Members," which succinctly identified four primary ingredients for continuing faculty development:

"1. A philosophy of continuing faculty education that recognizes the responsibility of both the individual faculty member and the administrator for its accomplishment.

2. A school climate that is conducive to faculty self-direction, individual freedom of thought and action, and a sense of personal responsibility for that action.

3. School policies and practices that support the concept of continuing faculty education together with a corresponding system of rewards and recognition.

4. A willingness on the part of the administrator to develop long range goals and to seek vigorously the means, financial and other, of achieving these goals" (as cited in Soffen, 1967, pp. 135-136).

Soffen's work, as that of Miller and Wilson, is easily generalized to faculty professional development in community colleges.

Singer (1969)

Singer, under the auspices of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), conducted a survey to determine the availability and adequacy of continuing professional in-service training for full time faculty and administrators at two-year colleges which were members of AAJC. Prior to the survey little was known about the need for or availability of in-service training at the community colleges. In the preface to Singer's study, Gleazer wrote:

> There is an . . . important requirement to keep teaching tools and abilities sharpened as new techniques and knowledge increase. Especially in the two-year institutions, teachers . . . clearly owe it to their students to remain alert and responsive to all significant developments.
>
> We have had only impressions about the real dimensions of the need for so-called in-service training. We have known even less about the kinds and amount of such training which is available . . . . (p. i)

Presidents of two year institutions were asked "to describe their own 'felt needs' for in-service development and improvement of their faculty and staff . . . . [and] to compare this demand with the known national supply of relevant training opportunities" (p. 2). Based on responses of 288 colleges, which was a 38% return, nearly one-fourth of the respondents felt faculty needed more training in general education, curriculum and learning. The respondents also believed more training was needed in the academic and occupational fields, administration and supervision, counseling and guidance, and aspects of the two-year college–particularly about the "Philosophy, History and Goals of the Two year College" (p. 2). Some presidents were interested in having training "to help their faculty better meet community needs and concomitantly, for improved handling of public communications and related activities so as to further strengthen the overall 'service dimension' of their institutions" (p. 23).

In terms of the "preferred training conditions" (p. 25), of the 288 respondents

- 58.6% preferred faculty to be trained on the community college campus (p. 16)
- 55.0% felt the greatest benefit from the training would be if it were conducted during the school year (p. 16)
- 29.8% thought in-service training should last under one week (p. 17)
- 30.5% thought in-service training should last one to two weeks (p. 17)
- 54.8% thought the two-year colleges would pay from up to one-half to the full amount of the instructional and living expenses for the training (p. 17)
- 74.9% thought for faculty to receive graduate credit for in-service training was either essential or desirable (p. 18)
- 41.9% said workshops and short courses to meet the in-service training needs of their institution were unavailable (p. 18)
- 53.0% said workshops and short courses to meet the in-service training needs of their institution were "fairly available" (p. 18)

Based on the results of the survey, Singer concluded, "It seems painfully evident that both two and four-year colleges still have a long way to go to 'close the training gap'" (p. 2).

Chronister (1970)

Based on the results of Singer's (1969) survey of junior college administrators which assessed "the adequacy, as well as availability, of in-service professional development activities for staffs of two-year institutions" (p. 2), Chronister proposed that graduate schools provide in-service training for community college faculty at the community colleges.

Chronister used the results of Singer's (1969) survey as evidence to support his proposal, specifically pointing out that of the 288 respondents

- 59% preferred that in-service programs take place at the community college campus,
- 55% of the survey respondents thought the in-service programs should take place during the school year
- 62% thought that graduate credit should be offered for professional development training, and
- 12.9% thought that offering graduate credit for professional development training was essential. (pp. 2-3)

A critical question was whether or not the community colleges would pay for their faculties to receive in-service training from the graduate schools. Nearly 55% of the respondents to Singer's survey indicated that their community colleges would pay one half or more of the cost (p. 4).

Chronister proposed that graduate schools should offer professional development to community college faculty because "[they] may lack understanding of the teaching-learning process" (p. 2). At the same time, he explained that graduate schools previously had not been involved with community college in-service training because of "their lack of understanding of the basic philosophy of the two-year institution, as well as its peculiar problems" (p. 4). He recommended that, if the graduate schools decide to provide in-service training for the faculty of two-year colleges, then the graduate schools "must come to a better understanding of the two-year college" (p. 5).

Chronister's proposal is evidence that by 1970 the need to provide professional development for community college faculty was being taken seriously by both two- and four-year institutions. As Chronister summarized "the need for in-service professional development programs for community college faculty and staff is a documented and very real issue facing contemporary higher education" (p. 7).

O'Banion (1972)

O'Banion was commissioned by the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, a council established in 1967 by Public Law 90-35 and appointed by the president of the United States, to write a report on staff development in community-junior colleges (p. iv). His report described the general characteristics of the community-junior college and its students. But it also described in detail the characteristics of community-junior college teachers and their professional development needs because, as O'Banion explained, "at the heart of all developing preservice and in-service programs for the training of community-junior college instructors is teaching" (p. 23).

O'Banion contended that too little attention had been paid to the increased need for staff development. He feared that unless the need was immediately recognized and financially supported, the full potential of the community-junior college would be unrealized (p. v). He referenced Singer's 1969 survey of AAJC member colleges as evidence that supported his fear, indicating that "administrators confirmed the generally dismal state of in-service programs for community-junior college faculty" (p. 159). Further, O'Banion reported that "ninety-five percent of all (288) respondents 'expressed their conviction that the training which their people needed was *not* adequately available within their regions at least at the present time' (AACC, In-Service, 1969)" (p. 159).

O'Banion called most preservice programs, i.e. university courses, for the preparation of community-junior college staff "grossly inadequate" (p. 84). He supported in-service programs over preservice programs, saying:

> If in-service programs are to be designed to meet the needs [of community-junior college faculty], primary responsibility must be assumed by the community-junior college. Staff development must be important enough for the college to integrate it as a primary activity . . . . The community-junior college must define its own needs for staff development, and must provide the basic funds to support programs. (p. 102)

O'Banion discussed the general state of community college faculty professional development. "Some colleges," he said, "provide no in-service opportunities; most provide at least an orientation program preceding the beginning of fall classes; some even provide for periodic programs during the year and allow staff members to attend off-campus programs" (p. 103). "Too few," he concluded, "provide a well-designed, strongly supported, total institution in-service program" (p. 103).

He considered the lack of leadership among top administrators as a primary reason for inadequate community college faculty professional development programs, explaining:

> Many presidents assume an avuncular role and see in-service education as a one-day orientation session where they welcome new staff to join "the little family" of distinguished faculty. Or programs are organized by the academic dean and department heads to relay information. A consultant from a nearby university or neighboring community-junior college may be invited to speak about the mission of the community-junior college or the nature of the community-junior college student, and in-service education is not considered again until next year. (p. 103)

Other reasons that O'Banion gave for inadequate professional development programs included administrators perpetuating "blind salary schedules which reward only the quantity, not the quality of accumulated graduate course hours" (p. 103), and inadequate funding. He explained that "in the past, staff development programs have been classed as low priority programs and thus, have received few funds. In general, this low priority status has been maintained during the present high competition for budget dollars" (p. 104). O'Banion believed that the state or federal government should provide funds "to help the community-junior college to develop in-service development programs. . ." (p. 104).

O'Banion outlined a plan for effective staff development. His first point was that "someone must assume major responsibility for coordinating the program. . . [someone] should be clearly in charge" (p. 103). Second, "the program should be a continuing program through the year and should be related to long range improvement in the college" (p. 103). Third, "the program should be designed to achieve institutional goals through the development of individual staff members. Many group activities may be available, but each staff member should have a program for his personal in-service development" (p. 103). Fourth, "staff development programs should be integrated with evaluation processes to allow the individual and the college to determine progress" (p. 104). "The aim," said O'Banion, "is to develop a program that is so integrated into the fabric of the college that staff accept as normal the opportunity to plan goals and carry out activities that help them improve their teaching, administering and counseling" (p. 104).

O'Banion's report is one of the earliest and most thorough examinations of faculty professional development in community colleges. However, he offered neither evidence to support the efficacy of the staff development program that he outlined, nor did he discuss the similarities between his recommendations and the earlier recommendations of Miller and Wilson (1963) and Soffen (1967).

Freedman, with Brown, Ralph, Shukraft, Bloom, and Sanford (1979)

Freedman, with Brown, Ralph, Shukraft, Bloom, and Sanford–hereafter referred to as Freedman–interviewed "some 700 randomly selected professors" (p. vi) on a wide range of university and college campuses which included community colleges. Their concern was the "personality development among faculty members–or personality development in adult years" (p. vi). They defined personality as "a wide range of human abilities and activities . . . . [embracing] values, character, intellectual functioning and educational dispositions" (p. vi). They defined development as "a heightening of self-awareness, an increase of autonomy and broadening of perspective on the world" (p. v).

Freedman explained that "most programs of faculty development–orientation sessions, sabbaticals, visiting lecturers and the rest–are designed to help professors become more effective in their present professional roles" (p. v). They believed that these "narrow conceptions of faculty and their activities have probably been the chief barrier to improved education and teaching" (p. vii). As a result, they argued "faculty development programs designed to reward good teaching, render assistance to poor teachers or train good teachers will surely founder unless they are based on [an enlarged awareness of faculty members and their situation]" (p. vii).

Freedman submitted that "academic institutions must be as concerned with the development of their faculty as with the development of their students and must provide educational opportunities for faculty to understand themselves better" (p. vi). However, according to Freedman:

> at times the phrase faculty development has a scary ring. Too often develop is used in the active sense: faculty are wanting and something will be done to perfect them, evolve them or promote their growth . . . . Faculty members with a modicum of self-respect and dignity resent being treated in this way. (p. x)

In contrast, Freedman recommended approaching faculty development

> as a process of unfolding, of making latent processes active, of increasing amplitude, of evolving from a lower to a higher state. Faculty members may increase their understanding of their social and organizational situation, and such knowledge will make them better teachers, better researchers, and better educators generally . . . . They can understand how it is that certain faculty roles as they are now defined can foster narrow outlooks and impair personal and professional realization. (p. x)

Freedman explained that academic men and women suffer from a lack of professional identity:

> They do not seem to have a sense of belonging to a body of professionals with shared goals, shared procedures for attaining them and agreed ways of evaluating their realizations . . . . The majority of faculty members do not publish or even do any scholarly research beyond the Ph.D. dissertations. (p. 2)

What is more, according to Freedman:

> Higher education has virtually no consensus concerning principles of pedagogy, and without it no rational system of rewards for good teaching can be put into practice. And most faculty members have only the vaguest idea of the organizational workings or the social psychology their institutions. (p. 3)

Freedman explained that to address the needs of faculty with effective faculty development requires “a complex and comprehensive holistic or system theory approach” (p. 11). Such an approach recognizes that “student development is inextricably intertwined with curriculum, with faculty development and with the development of administrators and presidents" (p. 11). To use a holistic approach to faculty development, Freedman recommended that

> architects of faculty development programs should include three major theoretical and practical elements in their programs: 1) Systematic conception of the institution's educational goals. 2) Systematic ideas of personality development in the adult years–of how and why adults change. 3) Systematic understanding of the nature of organizational functioning. (pp. 11-12)

Freedman explained that "some community agreement or commonality of purpose regarding the educational enterprise is necessary as a baseline or environment for faculty growth" (p. 12).

The researchers described five stages of faculty development:

Stage one	"Faculty members have a simple view of their role and the nature of their work. Their professional reference group provides their role definition, they enact their role in conventional fashion" (p. 97).
Stage two	"The professors in this stage have a more differentiated notion of their role than do their Stage One colleagues" (p. 98). They have had some experience with diverse opinions and with views contrary to their own.
Stage three	"The faculty members have more distance from the reference group definitions of their role. They have a heightened

	consciousness of choice and are therefore aware of possible limitations of their freedom" (p. 98).
Stage four	The faculty members . . . not only have a sense of freedom and relativity in social roles, but they have also evolved a personal way of functioning. They have mastered some role conflicts and have achieved partial synthesis" (pp. 98-99).
Stage five	"Faculty members have a more clearly articulated position than do their colleagues of stage four. . . . included in their philosophy of education is explicit concern with helping students develop a sense of values or character" (p. 99).

Freedman recognized the challenge of developing faculty members from stage one to stage five when they observed:

> Individual personalities and organizational structures are complementary. One cannot be changed unless the other is also changed. Structures, however, are more tractable than people, and for this reason most studies in higher education have neglected personality and emphasized structure. (p. 164)

Freedman advocated using faculty professional development to address the social and psychological issues faculty face and in so doing to help the faculty members develop more complete personalities as college teachers. The end result may be desirable, but the process is difficult.

The approach of Freedman to faculty development is one of the more original additions to the repertoire of faculty professional development concepts. Compared with traditional faculty professional development, which focuses on the mechanics of college teaching, Freedman proposed using faculty professional development to enhance the spirit or essence of being a college teacher. Their approach is related to one of the questions proposed by this study, which asks how responsive professional development plans have been to the needs and interests of faculty.

Faculty Professional Development Studies and Reports from the 1980s

More research and reports specifically about community college faculty professional development emerged during the 1980s. Community colleges began describing their faculty professional development programs. More emphasis was placed on making professional development more inclusive by including part-time faculty, continuing education faculty, and non-teaching staff, in addition to full-time faculty.

Heelan (1980)

Heelan proposed a model of staff development for "credit-free" (i.e. continuing education) instructors at North Hennepin Community College (NHCC), Hennepin, Minnesota, with the conviction that it could be used at other community colleges. Her approach to developing the model was first to determine "what elements should be included in a program that fosters a sense of 'belonging', that engenders constant growth and flexibility and prepares credit-free instructors for fulfilling their role as facilitators for adult learning" (p. 5), and then to assemble the appropriate elements "into a total program of staff development" (p. 5).

While explaining that literature on staff development programs for credit instructors was not useful in developing programs for non-credit instructors, she did recognize the similarities between credit and non-credit instructors. These similarities included "a need to be accountable to the learner, a tendency to be content oriented, a frequent lack of formal teacher preparation, and the charge to work with adults as well as being adults" (p. 11).

After deciding that "faculty development is not to be imposed on faculties, [that] it should involve them as fully as possible" (p. 16), Heelan surveyed 72 credit-free instructors at NHCC to identify staff development issues so that their responses could be included in her model. Heelan's "proposed model for staff development is a synthesis of information gained from the literature reviewed, the credit-free instructors surveyed and the committee to which the model was presented" (p. 53). She designed her model to produce "a continual flow of concerns, new ideas and new solutions" (p. 53) by integrating problem awareness, needs assessment and problem solutions into each of the six components of her model. The six components included pre-hiring interview, contract development, orientation, evaluation, on-going in-service, and a recognition system (p. 53).

The significance of Heelan's model is that the non-credit faculty for whom it was designed had a voice in its design, and it incorporates on-going mechanisms for change. Her model for a staff development program, therefore, can be on-going: with adjustments made to its component parts as necessary to address changing development needs.

O'Banion (1981)

O'Banion's 1981 report was produced as a result of his 1972 report when the President's National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development commissioned him to gather data on "the most creative and potent staff development programs in community colleges," (1981, p. iv) to serve as models for other community colleges. Before presenting the outstanding professional development programs, O'Banion established the context:

> By the middle 1970s, though community colleges offered staff development activities, few had staff development programs in the sense of an organized, purposeful, supported attempt to provide for the professional and personal growth of all staff . . . . Most colleges, while they offered some activities, had little idea of the range of their staff development activities. Fewer colleges still had developed a rationale for staff development programs. (p. 3)

O'Banion offered three perspectives with universal rationales for staff development. These perspectives were national, local, and "staff development as institutional change. The national perspective recognized the uniqueness of the community college and "its need for staff development to preserve that national uniqueness" (p. 3).

The local perspective included a variety of rationales:

- Staff members need updating in their disciplines
- Staff members need to keep up with new developments in education

- Staff members need to “become attuned and stay attuned to the special philosophy and commitment of the community college” (p. 6)
- Staff members should develop an appreciation and understanding of community college students and the changing nature of the student populations
- Induction opportunities are needed “for those who come new to the institution, especially those who come from business and industry with no background in education” (p. 7)
- “Staff development is necessary in creative institutions simply to provide opportunities for renewal for the weary and the worn out” (p.7)
- “[A] growing number of community colleges support staff development as the key for developing a sense of community in the college” (p.7)
- “Some colleges say that all staff development is for . . . personal growth and that personal growth leads to professional growth and . . . to better instruction and to better education” (p. 8).

O’Banion further explained:

> The rationale for staff development as institutional change was derived from a growing awareness among community college leaders that staff development is much more than “in-service training” . . . . [that formerly] was something to be handled only sporadically and then only as an adjunct activity to more central roles in the institution. As such, in-service training was not conceived as being an important force or function in the institution. (p. 8)

O'Banion also identified "a set of experiences for organizing a staff development that may be helpful to most . . . community colleges" (p. 128) which he described as "common elements or approaches that should be considered in organizing a staff development program that really works" (p. 129). His list of common elements included:

- Assessment to determine the need for a program.

  He names four kinds of helpful assessments:

  1. administrative views and support;
  2. present level of staff development activities;
  3. institutional and personal/professional needs; and,
  4. internal and external resources available to the institution (p. 129).
- A statement of philosophy for the staff development program developed and approved by the staff (p. 159).
- A program of activities derived from the assessment of needs and interests of those for whom the program is planned and from the mission, needs, and priorities of the institution consistent with the institution's resources, participants' expectations, and "the creativity of the staff development coordinator" (p. 140).
- Incentives and rewards for participants (p. 149).
- Adequate funding (p. 151).
- Program evaluation (p. 154).

The establishment of "rationales" on which to base a professional development program and the emergence of "a set of experiences for organizing a staff development program" (p. 128) may provide some common denominators for understanding why community college faculty professional development programs have lacked constancy.

McCright (1983)

McCright's dissertation was a survey of the 39 part-time faculty members at Marshalltown Community College, Iowa, to determine their professional development interests. The survey was born out of an administrator's curiosity about what professional development activities would interest part-time faculty.

The professional development program offered to the part-time staff consisted of

"1. an evening orientation meeting . . . before classes begin in the fall semester;
2. individual conferences with administrators and other faculty members on a 'need' basis;
3. a student evaluation of part-time faculty members' performance in the classroom;
4. a part-time faculty members' handbook;
5. encouragement . . . to participate in committee work of the college" (pp. 2-3).

By comparison, the traditional professional development program for full-time faculty members at the college consisted of

"1. five scheduled workshop days for the entire faculty. These workshop days included work in instructional development, organizational development, faculty growth, and individual preparation for the coming semester;.
2. encouragement to attend off-campus workshops, seminars, and institutes;.

3. a professional library;
4. a salary schedule which encouraged the accumulation of graduate hours;
5. informal suggestions and guidance by administrators through annual faculty evaluation." (p. 2).

Surveys were sent to 39 part-time instructors; 31 were returned. Based upon responses to the survey, the professional development activities most desired by the part-time instructors were

1. "keeping abreast of new development in my discipline" (p. 14),
2. "gaining greater depth of knowledge in my discipline or specialization" (p. 14),

and

3. "determining what content will best prepare the student for attainting his education goals or employment" (p. 14).

The professional development activities least desired based upon the part-time instructors' responses were

1. "finding ways to improve teaching conditions" (p. 14),
2. "organizing content of courses into a logical cohesive syllabi" (p. 16),
3. "developing presentations for community groups" (p. 14),
4. "becoming a member of committees on campus," (p. 14), and
5. "learning to conduct human potential groups or other kinds of growth groups for students" (p. 14).

In ranking "perceived professional development incentives," the part-time faculty favored "special recognition of innovative teaching," and "merit pay increases." They gave low rankings to "fringe benefits, appointment to faculty rank, involvement in policy-making" or "receiving recognition through media" (p. 17).

McCright observed that "the findings present a very difficult challenge to administrators who have the responsibility for planning professional development programs for part-time faculty members" (p.16). He offered two reasons for the difficulty of the challenge. The first reason was that the college had little experience in preparing such programs, relying instead upon

> instructors to prepare themselves through their original degree work, summer courses and individual reading to maintain an adequate, up-to-date knowledge base for instruction. This coupled with heavy reliance on textbooks to organize the course and to bring the knowledge base up-to-date has satisfied many college's [sic] requirements. (p. 16)

Second, the results of McCright's survey indicated that part-time faculty were not interested in Marshall Community College's "traditional faculty development programs for full-time instructors [that] often emphasize[d] pedagogical techniques and/or student-oriented activities" (p.16). The part-time faculty were not interested in professional development that did not involve their discipline, and they were not interested in developing their teaching techniques.

This study surveyed the professional development *interests* without assessing the professional development *needs* of part-time faculty. Possibly a needs survey of part-time faculty would have provided the college with information necessary to provide professional development programs that would have developed their teaching skills and their desire to be more involved with the college. This survey does not provide needs information, but it does satisfy an administrator's curiosity about part-time faculty interests, and it does not require the college to make any improvement in the part-time faculty professional development program.

Shawl (1984)

Shawl, dean of Educational Development at Golden West College, California, explained how the college's 1981 commitment to staff development revitalized the college in spite of reduced resources and layoffs.

The college's commitment to staff development included creating the position of dean of education development. The "dean reports directly to the president, sits as full voting member of all major college councils and committees but has no one who reports to him with the exception of a secretary" (pp. 2-3).

The college established the Educational Development Center to house professional development activities and provide "visual proof" (p. 3) of the college's continuing commitment to staff development. The college also provided funds for faculty to use "to improve classroom teaching activities" (p.3). Shawl explained that "the primary thrust of our program is to be able to respond to individual faculty needs and to do so quickly and effectively" (p. 3).

The premise of the Golden West's staff development program was that just as all learners do not learn at the same, "similarly, all faculty are not ready for nor do they have the time for the exact same professional development" (p. 4). By focusing on faculty learning needs, Golden West created an individualized professional development program. Shawl explained, "Faculty have differing interests as to what will help their teaching at various times and the program must be capable of responding to the individual faculty member with the activity he/she is ready to learn" (p. 4).

The college did periodic needs assessments to determine the interests of faculty and to provide planning information. The college ran a workshop or seminar when it found that a group wanted a particular activity. While Shawl thought that workshops, seminars, lectures, and conferences should be part of a staff development program, he cautioned against making them the main focus of a staff development program. He said, "Too many staff development programs are judged by how many workshops or seminars are held and how many faculty and staff attend" (p. 4). Shawl questioned the value of these activities unless faculty can do something with the information or skills they gain.

Shawl discussed the rewards Golden West had for faculty in the staff development program, which included "salary unit credit" (p. 6) for some activities, sabbatical leave, "per diem rate to work on a project which is beyond . . . normal instructional development, [and] royalty payment for instructional materials developed by faculty and sold by the Educational Development Center" (p. 6). A newsletter included write-ups about faculty activities. Shawl's major point was "if you want faculty to change and to innovate, you must put resources into the process" (p. 7), emphasizing "don't insult [faculty] by asking them to do it for nothing" (p. 7).

The Golden West Educational Development Center's budget was $100,000 per year, which amounted to less than one half of one per cent of the college budget (p. 7).

The funding for staff development remained firm through three years of declining funds and a reduction in force. The professional development program "had solid support from faculty and administration" (p.7).

The essence of the Golden West professional development program was to let each faculty member determine his or her individual professional development needs, and for the college through its Educational Development Center to provide the resources necessary for the faculty member to satisfy his or her needs. Such an approach institutionalized the staff development program, or stated another way, turned professional development into a constant at this college.

Harnish (1986)

The purpose of Harnish's report was to "present a picture of faculty from the perspective of faculty development" and "to emphasize the extent and diversity of professional development programs, opportunities, and interests" (p. 20) at Niagara County Community College (NCCC) during the 1985-86 academic year. She prefaced her detailed report on the faculty's professional development activities with the declaration that

> professional development has long been a priority at NCCC. Faculty constitute a valuable resource of the institution, and their continued professional vitality and growth are crucial elements in the quality of educational programs and instruction available to students. The college is committed to providing the resources,

> opportunities, and programs which encourage faculty to pursue their professional development in order to enhance the quality of college programs. (p. 2)

She followed this declaration with a quote from NCCC's *Middle States Self-Study Report:*

> "Diversified professional development among faculty and staff is essential for the enrichment of the learning environment. The intent of professional development should be to maintain, supplement, and broaden already developed expertise and skills and to cultivate new interests and directions which add to our existing body of knowledge." (p. 2)

Harnish divided the professional development activities into twelve categories: college-sponsored professional development programs, off-campus professional development and travel, professional development travel, sabbaticals, State University of New York (SUNY) tuition waivers, tuition-free courses at NCCC, memberships in professional organizations, instructional resource development grants–summer 1985, individual faculty accomplishment/professional contributions, awards and recognition for faculty excellence, organizational support structures for professional development, and individual teaching improvement. Each category included a brief description of the activity, information about its cost and the degree of faculty involvement. Based on the expenditures listed in the report, NCCC allocated $54,627.55 to faculty's professional development activities, distributed the as follows:

- $1,910 for three workshops for new part-time faculty (p. 4)
- $11,711.55 for off-campus professional development and travel (p.5)

- $19,021 for sabbaticals (p. 9)
- $4,097 for partial tuition waiver for courses taken at other institutions (p. 10)
- $2,014 for free tuition for courses taken at NCCC (p. 10)
- $2,560 for faculty memberships in professional organizations (p. 11)
- $13,314 for Summer Instructional Resource Development grants (p.12)

Even though the NCCC committed the funds and organizational support for professional development, the number of faculty members who participated varied. Harnish noted that "participation in the January Professional Development Week events varied widely . . . . A future goal . . . is even greater faculty initiative and involvement" (p. 4). As for other activities:

- out of a total of 141 faculty, 63 were involved with off-campus professional development and travel (p. 5)
- 55 different faculty members received release time to attend off-campus professional development activities (p. 8)
- 12 faculty members received tuition waivers (p. 10)
- 18 faculty members took classes at NCCC (p. 10)
- 11 faculty members received instructional resource grants (pp. 12-13).

The report does not indicate whether or not the participation numbers were for unduplicated participation; nor does it indicate whether or not part-time faculty were involved in the professional development activities.

Harnish recognized 30 faculty members for "individual faculty accomplishments/professional contributions (publications, research, creative projects, awards, certificates and licenses, degrees)" (pp. 13-15). She included a page devoted to "awards and recognition for faculty excellence" (p.10) which listed the names of people who received awards or were promoted to a higher academic rank. The page included photos of the five people promoted from associate professor to professor, and the three recipients of the President's Award for Excellence.

At NCCC, a unionized campus, faculty professional development was subject to negotiation. The union at NCCC supported faculty professional development by linking it with evaluation and promotion. The "faculty evaluation and promotion" agreement and the "professional growth" requirements recommended by the "Joint Labor-Management Study Committee on Faculty Evaluation" (p. 17) were outlined in the report.

Harnish described the composition of the college's organizational support and structures for professional development:

- Professional Development Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate charged with "promoting professional development through evaluation of proposals, development and promotion of professional development activities, and evaluation of program results, in addition to recommending sabbatical leave request to the president," (p. 18).
- Instructional Resources Committee responsible for "review and recommendation of Instructional Resource Development grant proposals, as well as encouraging uses of instructional media for effective teaching" (p. 18).

- The Associate Dean/Director of Educational Development in the Office of Academic Affairs tasked with coordinating faculty professional development activities (p. 18).
- The Director of Human Resource Development in the Office of the President responsible for "effectively addressing both individual and college needs" (p. 18).
- An institutional membership in the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) (p. 18).

The report summary offered NCCC's professional development tenets:

> Professional development is more than a listing of activities and resources. Professional development is people who value growth and lifelong learning for themselves as well as for students. To be successful it requires institutional support and commitment at many levels . . . . Effective professional development also relies upon the involvement and initiative of faculty in determining the best use of resources to meet diverse needs. (p. 20)

Harnish's report offered a dynamic view of NCCC's faculty professional development program as it was provided by the college, used by the faculty, and negotiated by the union in one particular academic year.

Miller and Ratcliff (1986)

Miller and Ratcliff surveyed 187 full-time faculty members in 15 Iowa community colleges to find out how many hours a year the faulty engaged in professional development. Their results showed that:

- faculty with doctoral degrees reported the greatest number of hours of participation in professional development (p. 317)
- the level of the faculty's participation in professional development was not related to the teaching field of the faculty member, the individual's total years of teaching experience, or whether the chosen faculty development activities were financed by personal or other sources (p. 317)
- individual faculty members spent an average of 161 hours a year in development activities
- the activities that faculty chose did not necessarily lead to salary increases or advancement
- with the exception of coursework and special projects, faculty participation in single development activities averaged less than seven hours, which according to Miller and Ratcliff was of "insufficient duration to constitute an adult learning project" (p. 317).
- faculty would participate in some form of staff development, regardless of whether that participation was rewarded by the college (p. 342)

Based on the results of this study, Miller and Ratcliff recommended that colleges should assess faculty participation in all forms for professional development, not just professional development activities sponsored or financed by the college, to obtain a more accurate indication of how involved faculty were with professional development. Miller and Ratcliff suggested but could not confirm that "the greater devotion of time to single development activities [might] prove more beneficial to faculty and college renewal than engaging faculty in multiple, short-term activities" (p. 342).

Of particular interest in this study was some faculty's willingness to participate in professional development activities with or without college funding or sponsorship.

Nickel (1986)

According to Nickel, the "rapidity of change in all areas of education [and faculty's need for a] change in behavior [provides a] compelling reason for on-going in-service education" (p. 13). Nickel faulted community college staff development for not "evaluating the results of programs" and for lacking long-range planning (p. 13).

Nickel designed a study "to determine the effects of the Curriculum and Instructional Development (CID) Center at Valencia Community College on faculty awareness and use of educational concepts, media materials, and testing strategies" (p. 13). Over a five year period, between 1977 and 1981, ten faculty members per year were given 60% release time to participate in the year-long in-service professional development project.

Nickel found that faculty's involvement with the Valencia Community College CID Center was a positive professional development experience for them and "benefited the quality of education at the institution" (p. 14). The evidence in support of her findings included:

1. "changes in awareness and use of the educational concepts, media materials and testing strategies were greater in the experimental group" (p. 15).
2. "members of the experimental group were much less negative about the use of diverse teaching methods, media materials, and testing strategies than were their colleagues in the control group" (p. 15).
3. "the changes in behavior as a result of the CID Center experiment were evident beyond the responses on the survey" (p. 15).
4. "the CID Center experience served as a catalyst to unite professors from a single discipline into leadership roles in the department . . . . Professors from a single discipline who took part in the CID Center in differing years came to support one another as change agents within [their] department" (p. 15).
5. many instructors developed more effective working relationships with colleagues who shared the CID Center experience and [some] . . . became a nucleus which stimulated growth in [their] department" (p. 15).

Nickel urged "educational institutions [to] make adjustments to accommodate new information and changes in society and technology [and to give faculty the] opportunities, time and resources so that they can make curriculum changes which are backed by state-of-the-art information" (p. 15). She concluded that "in-service programs such as the one examined . . . do have a positive impact on the professional development and teaching behavior of participants" (p. 15). She recommended that postsecondary institutions plan in-service activities and provide adequate financial support.

Smith and Schwartz (1986)

Smith and Schwartz asked 14 faculty development consultants to analyze a classroom case study and recommend how the situation in the case should be handled. Smith and Schwartz found that recommendations given by 14 faculty development consultants were inconsistent in how they approached the case. "The faculty developers espoused openness and problem solving, but their case studies revealed behavior unlikely to lead to either" (p. 6). Smith and Schwartz distinguished between the faculty developers' "theories-of-action of which they are unaware, but which actually govern their behaviors" (p. 7) and the developers' "theories-in-use" which were "different from their espoused theories of effective action" (p. 7). Based on the results of the study, Smith and Schwartz suggested that "increasing faculty development effectiveness means becoming aware of your theory-in-use and the way in which it contradicts your espoused theory" (p. 7).

This study illustrates the unintentional difference between what faculty development consultants *tell* faculty to do in a given classroom situation, and what the consultants *actually do* when faced with the same situation. This is an unacceptable dichotomy, which may be resolved by using successful experienced classroom teachers who understand the realities of the classroom as faculty development consultants.

Such faculty development consultants are unlikely to contradict their theories-of-action with their theories-in-use.

Sorcinelli (1986)

Sorcinelli used both in-depth interviews and questionnaires to survey 112 faculty at a large state university to find out how faculty viewed their future in academia, how they set goals, what goals they set, and if they were thinking about a career change. Sorcinelli listed "limited resources, declining and changing enrollment patterns, and lowered faculty mobility" (p. 9) as reasons for the university's interest in determining if its policies were encouraging or impeding faculty's professional growth.

Sorcinelli found that "most faculty members set career goals and many shared common aspirations" (p. 10), however, differences existed depending on the rank of the faculty member. Other findings were that

- Faculty members desired "to contribute to their discipline through research" (p. 10).
- "Most faculty were concerned with finding time (reduced loads or semesters off or flexible staff) and support (internal grants, resources, facilities) for research" (p. 10).
- "Emphasis on teaching noticeably declined at full rank . . . . Some expressed a desire for less teaching . . . .While enthusiasm for teaching declined, contentment with teaching effectiveness seemed to increase with rank" (p.10).

- "Over half the interviewees mentioned service goals" (p. 10). Some wanted to reduce their involvement; others considered it "compatible with career development" (p. 10) if the service was discipline related.
- "For many junior faculty, tenure was the only goal . . . . Full professors sought growth through a leave or sabbatical" (p. 10).
- "Full professors often mentioned retirement and leisure goals . . . . Senior faculty called on the university to help with the transition to retirement, and to provide options for those who desired to perform research, teach, or somehow contribute to the university beyond age 70" (p. 10).
- "A third of the sample wanted to improve the quality of academic life–the prestige or collegiality of [their] department, school or university" (p. 11).
- "Faculty members were generally satisfied with academic life . . . . Contemplated change was almost exclusively in terms of moves to other universities or colleges" (p. 11).

Sorcinelli concluded that "faculty wanted the institution to provide more time and support for scholarship" (p. 12). She suggests that "faculty development programs need to find ways to assist individuals in planning scholarly and instructional goals that are harmonious–and that are beneficial to both faculty members and the students they teach" (p. 12). She made another observation with professional development implications:

> If many individuals at higher ranks indicate that they are not leaving the institution, the university faces a real challenge. Continued effort to establish support for research, teaching, multidisciplinary projects, faculty exchange, as

> well as experiments with more flexible arrangements for staffing leaves, sabbaticals, dual careers and retirement will be necessary to create a better environment. (p. 12)

Sorcinelli surveyed university faculty; however, her observations–particularly about aging faculty–may also be relevant to professional development needs of aging community college faculty.

Valek (1986)

Valek outlines a variety of changes that took place in community colleges during the 1980s that potentially dampened faculty's enthusiasm and desire to keep growing professionally and personally. She cited decreasing professional opportunities for faculty, declining money supply, increasing numbers of non-traditional students, and "instructors assuming heavier teaching loads with fewer support services" (p. 93).

In the face of mostly negative changes that were taking place at the community college, Valek bluntly stated, "You cannot expect to enhance the effectiveness of faculty in the classroom if the environment of the institution does not support growth and development, of [sic] the leadership of the institution does not model a commitment to quality" (p. 94). She identified a variety of professional development activities as a means to reinforce a college's commitment to quality. She recommended "a comprehensive faculty development program" designed to "promote faculty growth, improve student learning, and create an effective environment for teaching and learning"

(p. 94). She recognized three approaches to developing a program–faculty development, instructional development or organizational development–and said:

> While these three approaches are conceptually distinct, these approaches are not mutually exclusive. Since faculty members are responsible for developing their professional competence in the classroom, designing and implementing curricula, and sharing in the governance of their institution, these approaches correspond to the total role of the faculty member. (p. 94)

Valek noted that "faculty development programs must be sensitive to the fact that renewal is an individual need" (p. 94). She also recognized that "faculty development programs are often viewed as expensive and expendable" (p. 94), but she indicated that some colleges carried out a variety of programs with relatively small budgets.

The remainder of her article is an annotated list of professional development activities that colleges could choose to provide. Her list included grants programs, guest lecturers selected from among the college's faculty, faculty exchange program, internships, shared purchase arrangements to obtain computers for faculty, release time, faculty scholarship programs, faculty workshops, conferences, master teacher seminars, networks, feedback not necessarily tied to faculty evaluation, growth contracts, chair holder program, organizational improvement, curricular change, mentor programs, and recognition.

Valek concluded with the admonition that "the single most important element [in delivering excited and motivated faculty to students] is an organizational climate that provides and promotes opportunities for personal and professional growth" (p. 97).

Valek argued for community colleges to provide fully funded comprehensive faculty professional programs even when the colleges have reduced financial resources.

Florida State Board of Community Colleges (1987)

The Florida State Board of Community Colleges (FSB of CC) mandated that "each community college must develop a plan for staff and program development and update it annually" (1987, p. 22). The FSB of CC (1987) supported the need for "institutions to have special summer faculty development programs and other opportunities [for faculty] to keep abreast," (p. 3). Though they had little research to establish the relationship between good teaching and professional development activities, they supported the need for professional development on the assumption that: "Teachers cannot remain stimulating without continuing to learn . . . . When teachers stop learning, they begin to repeat themselves and eventually lose touch with their students and their environment" (p. 17).

The FSB of CC distinguished between in-service and professional development programs, and endorsed them both. In-service programs were those offered by the college for all faculty to attend, while professional development programs were for individuals. The FSB of CC criticized in-service education as "frequently quite piecemeal . . . seldom being based upon faculty needs and often being conducted in a manner that negates the principles of good teaching and learning" (p.21).

The FSB of CC urged community college boards of trustees to recognize and encourage professional development, specifying that "professional development or self-renewal should be available to every faculty and staff member . . . in some form, [which] may include sabbatical and research leaves, summer grants, workshops, scholarships, formal classes, and informal classes" (p. 22).

Richardson and Moore (1987)

Richardson and Moore surveyed 62 community colleges in Texas "to assess the extent of faculty development programs and the means, the purpose, and degree to which they were evaluated" (p. 19). Of the 62 questionnaires mailed to either the "person in charge of faculty development or to the chief academic officer" at each of the community colleges, 56 questionnaires were returned. Four of the community colleges had no faculty professional development program, 52 had "some form of organized faculty development activities" (p. 24) and reported that "instructional deans rather than faculty development officers" (p.28) were responsible for the programs.

Orientation programs were the most common professional development activities. Of the 52 colleges "89% had orientation activities for new full-time faculty and 58% for continuing full-time faculty. For new part-time faculty, 43% had orientation activities with 29% having activities for continuing part-time faculty" (p. 24).

"The most prevalent on-campus activities not including orientation activities were single session workshops (69%) and all day programs for full-time faculty (62%)" (p. 24). The most prevalent off-campus activities were college-funded attendance at professional meetings (84%) and visits to other campuses (64%) (p. 24). "Sabbatical leaves were reported from 45% of the respondents. . . ." (p. 24).

The activities perceived as being the most useful for improving instruction were all day programs for full-time faculty, single session workshops, college funded attendance at professional meetings, and visits to other campuses (p. 25). Comparing on-campus activities with off-campus activities, the on-campus activities were considered more useful (p. 26).

The activity most often reported as evaluated was the mentor/model teacher program, which was evaluated by three of the four colleges that offered it. The next activities most often reported as evaluated were teaching consultants and all-day programs for full-time faculty. The least evaluated activity was the teacher exchange program (p. 26).

Richardson and Moore noted that "The most common evaluation method was verbal feedback which was reportedly used by many colleges in all categories except mentor/model teacher programs" (p.27). Other evaluation methods included open end written statements, questionnaires, and formal written reports. The least used methods were "pre-test/post-test, testing of student outcomes, and classroom observations" (p. 27).

Respondents were given four examples of how evaluations could be used and then asked to identify three ways in which they used them. Most of the answers were a combination of the examples, which included "to design new programs; to document effectiveness; [and] to eliminate ineffective sessions; to suggest new ideas" (p. 27). "Although some programs listed 'to document the effectiveness of the program' rarely did they also report . . . the use of a type of evaluation that was oriented toward assessing changes in teacher behavior or student outcome" (p. 28). Some respondents wrote that the evaluations were used "to determine presenter effectiveness, to meet Southern Association and Texas Education Agency requirements, to indicate a desire for follow-up by participant, for incentive pay, and to document personal growth activities" (p. 28). Richardson and Moore concluded

> there is little evidence that programs are being used as a major instrument for institutional change and improvement that is linked to the accomplishment of college goals and the establishment of accountability. Development activities seem mired in traditional hit-or-miss schemes that are evaluated more often than not on the basis of audience reaction. (p. 29)

While Richardson and Moore did not suggest that the faculty professional development activities were not useful, they did note that "the links between these activities and improved instruction has not been substantiated in the literature and, in general, is not substantiated by the evaluation methods used by practitioners in Texas" (p. 29).

They also pointed out that professional development

> activities that treat faculty members as a group rather than as individuals are the most frequently used methods; the effects of such methods on teaching and learning is frequently difficult to assess at levels that measure student and faculty outcomes. (p. 29)

Richardson and Moore questioned the staying power of professional development programs unless they demonstrate value. That value, they suggested, "must be demonstrated by practitioners and faculty members who design and participate in activities that can be effectively evaluated and reported" (p. 30).

Richardson and Moore's study raises the question of whether inadequate evaluation of professional development activities may contribute to the lack of constancy of professional development programs.

Katz and Henry (1988)

Katz and Henry's frustration with the apparent inability of what they called "short-term and episodic" efforts of faculty development to transform "teaching and learning" (p. x) led them to develop "a model that provides for long-term faculty learning" (p. x). The model involves faculty working in pairs with one teaching and the other observing and regularly interviewing a few students from the class. At the end of the semester, the two faculty members individually "reflect on and write about what they have gained through observation, interviewing and discussions about student learning and their own. Then they switch roles and repeat the process" (Fideler, 1991, p. 200).

Katz and Henry blamed the inadequacies of faculty professional development on the shift in the 1970s "to a new orientation that viewed students as customers and consumers" (p.3) which, they said, resulted in the "break in intellectual tradition [and] . . . frequently has led to a debasement of what is expected of students and to diminished intellectual efforts by faculty and students" (p. 3). Katz and Henry suggested that these changes

> frustrated many faculty and challenged them to rethink how they can reach their students. The rapid acceptance of the concept of faculty development from about 1973 onward and the many programs that exist in a majority of institutions encouraging faculty development testify to at least an implicit awareness of the historical changes (p. 3).

Katz and Henry's professional development model capitalizes on faculty's desire to reach their students by converting faculty members into classroom investigators learning about their students (p. 4). They saw their model as a means of providing "on-the-job education of the faculty members" (p. 10) and as being efficient and cost effective.

Katz and Henry said the institutionalization of their model required a "combination of strong administrative support and the participation of imaginative, respected, and institutionally secure faculty leaders" (p. 5). To begin the process, they recommended first "working with volunteers and at the same time try[ing] to allay the anxieties of nonparticipating colleagues" (p. 5-6).

Katz and Henry's model offered a means of helping faculty reinstate critical learning in their classrooms by learning more about the ways students can and can not learn. Their model was a radical change from the traditional professional development workshop.

Giroux (1989)

Giroux linked the success of students to funding for professional development of staff at the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. He summarized the connection, saying, "Simply stated, it is believed that there is a direct correlation between the quality of student success, and the commitment of financial resources to the development of skills and knowledge of college personnel" (p. 9).

He urged colleges to take faculty professional development seriously, explaining that "because the essential business of colleges is the development of students, there is a great risk of being at least perceived to be profoundly hypocritical if attention is not paid to the development of college personnel" (pp. 8-9). Giroux argued that colleges should provide faculty professional development for the sake of the students.

Faculty Professional Development Studies and Reports from the 1990s

During the 1990s more community colleges institutionalized faculty professional development and some began examining their professional development programs. Faculty professional development became staff professional development, as more colleges included all personnel in professional development activities. Other agencies became actively interested in faculty professional development.

Focus on Access, Community, and Excellence in Teaching (FACET) Commission (1990)

St. Petersburg Junior College (SPJC) appointed the Focus on Access, Community, and Excellence in Teaching (FACET) Commission to develop recommendations that would guide the college into the 21st century. The commission adopted a three-prong work plan. One of the prongs was "to explore ways to enrich teaching effectiveness including . . . instructional techniques, selection and orientation of faculty and staff, evaluation, rewards and recognition, and faculty and staff development" (1990, p. 1). The commission identified academic excellence, innovation and creativity, and leadership as three of its values and guiding principles. Each guiding principle had tenets that directly or indirectly related to professional development. The tenet under innovation and creativity challenged "all members of the college . . . to meet the goals of SPJC's mission by exploring and inventing new and stimulating ways of doing their work" (p. 5). Under the principle of leadership one of tenets was to "seek to develop effective, responsible leaders who develop and employ innovative teaching/learning methods" (p. 5). The tenet under academic excellence was direct. It said "We strive to commit ourselves to continual improvement through professional development," (p. 4).

The commission's recommendations included "developing and implementing a required comprehensive orientation program to meet the needs of all new employees" (p. 6). New faculty would be required to complete two approved graduate level courses: in effective teaching and learning, and in the philosophy and history of the community/junior college, noting that the classes "should also be professional development options for current full-time faculty and adjuncts" (p. 6). The committee also recommended "that SPJC develop and implement a long-range plan for faculty and staff development and renewal with the aim of integrating individual needs with institutional needs," (p. 8). The commission included six possible professional development components as a means of fulfilling their recommendation.

In this future-oriented report, the professional development of faculty and staff was a prime component.

Schuster, Wheeler and Associates (1990)

Schuster, Wheeler, and Associates severely criticized colleges and universities for ignoring the plight of American professors. They held that while four year colleges and universities routinely supported their faculty in the areas of research and scholarship, they "appear to have accorded faculty development a barely visible priority" (1990, p. 14). Schuster et al. drew a relationship between "the unevenness of faculty development efforts" and the "gradually deteriorating conditions for many American professors" (p. xiii).

Schuster et al. faulted colleges and universities for doing "little if anything to help faculty members (or nonacademic staff) move toward self-actualization" (p. 15). They complained that of the three major elements critical to faculty development programs only one, instructional development, had been widely implemented (p. xiii), and that the other two important elements, personal development and organizational development, had been ignored.

They listed eight "megatrend" developments as important for understanding the context within which programs designed to enhance faculty careers must operate: changing working conditions, declining compensation, the labor market, conflicting expectations, aging tenured faculty, shifting values on campuses, compressed career ladders, and low faculty morale resulting from the other negative trends (pp. 8-9). Schuster et al. contended that the "megatrend" developments made faculty's jobs more difficult. Schuster accused colleges and universities of being neither alert to "the ever-changing circumstances of their instructional staffs nor adequately resourceful about meeting their changing needs for professional development" (p. 3). He noted, "It is indeed striking how much has been written about faculty growth and renewal . . . and how few campuses have seen fit to develop comprehensive, systematic programs" (pp. 3-4).

While acknowledging that faculty development had matured "in some respects as a field" (p. 6) Schuster insisted that campus programs designed to assist faculty were "almost always too narrowly conceived and even more narrowly implemented" (p. 6). Schuster et al. stressed the need for a "mature" program that would "enhance professional and personal development into an "integrated systematic program" (p. 6). They determined that the chief prerequisite for such an integrated system was "a campus's commitment and will; [claiming that] with leadership and a modicum of resources . . . [relatively inexpensive] programs can be developed that will respond effectively to faculty and institutional needs" (p. xiii). They explained that the "obstacles to a successful, integrated program lie not in the technology of how to make a program work reasonably well, but rather in marshaling the requisite organizational will, or commitment to make faculty renewal a priority" (p. 16). They said,

> At base, it is the organizational culture that is salient, for that will determine whether an adequate faculty development program can take root and even flourish over time . . . . The campus culture must feature a shared commitment on the part of administration and faculty leadership to provide conditions conducive to faculty growth and renewal. Doing more of the same likely will not accomplish much; . . . instead, campus efforts must be systematic and continually evolving in order to adapt to evolving conditions. (p. 16)

Schuster et al. stressed the need for personal and professional faculty development programs that recognize the changing conditions in which faculty work. Furthermore, they recognize that whether or not such programs are developed is a function of a college's will and commitment.

Clough (1991)

When the California legislature passed a bill in 1988 mandating professional development for community college faculty and allocated five million dollars statewide to fund the mandate, they were responding to the concern reported by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges: "'instructors are not staying up to date in their fields. Reasons cited for this perception include lifetime credentialing, the lack of continuing education requirements, and the lack of staff development and in-service training . . . '" (as cited in Clough, p. 2).

To access the state money for professional development, community colleges had to "survey the personnel regarding their perceptions of staff development needs" (p. ii) and to "develop a Human Resource Development Plan" (p. ii). Clough's dissertation satisfied those requirements for Chabot and Las Positas Community Colleges.

Clough developed and administered an eight page "Staff Development Needs Assessment Questionnaire." In addition to determining the professional development needs, she also wanted to know what incentives would motivate the staffs of the two community colleges to participate in professional development activities.

The questionnaire was administered to 745 administrators, faculty, and classified staff at Chabot College and Los Positas College. She received a 77.5% (577) return (p. 115).

Based on the results of the survey, Clough concluded:

1. All three constituency groups consider "life-long learning important to performance within the institution" (p. 188).
2. The respondents were interested in staff development activities that related to their jobs and "supplemental areas of interest" (p. 188).
3. All three groups were interested in "organizational management techniques and strategies involving leadership, communication among all types of people, sharing new information, setting goals and priorities, and processes of decision making" (p. 189).
4. All thought that the concept and promotion of human resource development needed to "become institutionalized within the mission and goals of the organization" (p. 189).

5. The priorities for staff development were "(1) sharing of and collaborating of [sic] information, (2) developing computer skills, and (3) enhancing people-related interactions to support the activities and functions of the college (p. 189).
6. Main motivators for participating in staff development were "(1) salary increments, (2) replaced time, and (3) a resource center with proper equipment and staff assistance" (p. 189).
7. All agreed that if a conference, technical training, or workshop provided "pertinent information and/or skills," they would pay if the college would not (p. 189).
8. Some personnel have limited time for participating in in-house staff development "when they are already taking courses at a community college or university" (p. 189-190).
9. "Two-thirds of the faculty, administration, and many classified staff perceived days set aside specifically for staff development activities as an incentive to participate in professional growth" (p. 190).
10. "Fewer than twenty percent of the personnel have taken courses related to the mission and purposes of the community college" (p. 190).
11. All were interested in university courses that would "prepare them and /or enhance their activities within their college" (p. 190).
12. Communication needed to become a higher institutional priority (p. 190).

The results of the survey provided Clough with enough information to make recommendations for a "Human Resource Development Model" (pp. 190-192). Clough equated the professional development need of the respondents with their degree of willingness to participate in a slate of 72 professional development activities. Her model included:

1. Developing a collegial model for induction of new personnel with two weeks of preservice training and at least two years of in-service specialized training for new faculty.
2. Expanding the part-time faculty induction program
3. A mentor program that supports a "core of information/skills workshops" (p. 191).
4. Year-round in-house workshops
5. Workshops to emphasize collegial, collaborative interaction, or with concentration on particular information
6. Visiting other colleges
7. Multiple alternatives and opportunities to "customize, professionalize, and personalize the development of information and skills that they need" (p. 191)
8. Using resources of local universities
9. Developing and maintaining a staff resource center
10. Supplementing pay schedules "with continuous reward for participation in staff development activities" (p. 192)
11. Putting staff development on the organizational chart to help institutionalize it.

Clough's study is interesting and worthwhile, but if the California legislature had not mandated that California community colleges engage their faculty and staff in professional development, in all likelihood, the community colleges never would have asked her to do the study. The legislature mandated and provided some funding for professional development because it believed that community college faculties were not staying current in their fields.

Clough's dissertation helped two California community colleges begin to comply with the mandate. She used the information that she obtained to propose a "Human Resource Development Model" (p. 190).

Apparently California community colleges paid little attention to faculty professional development until the State legislature required it.

Engleberg (1991)

Engleberg proposed a needs assessment for determining what to include in staff development. She explained that "needs assessment is more than gathering information; its purpose is to assess that information and decide what should be done [emphasizing that] decision-making, not survey results is the cornerstone of the needs assessment process" (p. 216).

She suggested a multi-faceted assessment for determining faculty and staff needs and recommended the four methods used by Prince George's Community College. The methods included surveys, group process, social indications/statistic research, and job analysis/performance assessment. She identified the professional development activities that resulted from the use of each assessment method.

"The [full-time faculty] survey results revealed an interest in desire for professional development activities focused on scholarship rather than pedagogy . . . . [and] the need for support and recognition of faculty scholarship" (p. 217). The college responded by instituting an annual scholars reception, supporting a scholarly lectures series and summer seminars, increasing tuition reimbursement for continued faculty education, increasing funding for conference travel, and including information about faculty publications in the monthly instructional newsletter (pp. 217-218).

The results of an adjunct faculty survey "emphasized the importance of guidance from chairpersons, the expressed need for workshops on teaching/learning issues," as well as adjunct faculty's need for "more involvement with full-time faculty and/or departments" (p. 219). The findings from this survey resulted in teaching retreats for all faculty and special programs for adjunct faculty.

The group process assessment involved two group activities. One was retreats for the Professional Development Committee to discuss faculty development needs. This process (with the assistance of invited faculty development consultants) resulted in the development of a list of faculty development goals that were incorporated into the College's 1989 Master Plan.

The other group process assessment activity involved adjunct faculty focus groups, which identified needs including the need to keep up to date in their fields, and the need for recognition and reward. New adjunct faculty needed general information about the college and more contact with full-time faculty. As a result, adjunct faculty workshops, an adjunct faculty handbook, and special recognition and rewards for adjuncts were put in place.

The social indicators and statistic research confirmed that "the dramatic shift in student demographic [had] out-paced . . . changes in [the] faculty profile," (p. 220). The college reacted by creating "special curricular and instructional staff development programs including cross cultural workshops, projects to integrate the scholarship of other cultures into the curriculum, and cross cultural arts programs" (p.220).

The job analysis/performance assessment provided each full-time faculty member with information about his or her individual professional development needs. These needs were addressed through workshops or a peer mentoring program.

Engleberg considered the professional development needs assessments used by the college to be successful. Even so she issued a warning: "Administrators may view the time and cost of the needs assessment as unnecessary [and] needs assessment may not be linked to organizational goals" (p. 221). She concluded by reaffirming that "needs assessment is the essential first step in developing an effective staff development plan" (p. 221).

Even if a needs assessment is essential for effective staff development planning, if the warning that Engleberg issued comes to pass the opportunity to do a professional development needs assessment is seriously jeopardized.

Fideler (1991)

Fideler offered an inquiry-based approach to faculty development. She advocated the need for faculty development that "goes beyond conventional instructional improvement activities" to a "self-assessment and systematic inquiry into the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process" (p. 198). The purpose, according to Fideler, was to include a wider range of strategies that promote faculty vitality and productivity. She proposed and described four different professional development mechanisms:

classroom research	involves a teacher in the formal study of teaching and learning by studying how students respond to the teachers' efforts to teach them.
teaching cases	"case writing workshops are meant to generate within and across institutions a more vital discourse on teaching and learning" (p. 200).
Katz-Henry Model	"involves faculty in the learning process through peer collaboration and student interviewing" (p. 200).
writing	faculty are encouraged to "write down their insights, refine, document their work, [and] disseminate to the wider community the results of inquiry into teaching and learning" (p. 201).

Fideler stressed the need that faculty have for psychological support and encouragement from peers, chairs, deans, and the college in general when they are "engaged in self-directed inquiry into teaching and learning" (p. 203).

Fideler outlines four interesting approaches to professional development that she labels as "inquiry-based faculty development" (p. 198) methods. What she does not do is rate them for effectiveness. Her balanced review of the four approaches suggests that they are all equally useful.

Hoerner, Clowes, Lichtman and Allkins (1991)

Hoerner et al. (1991) conducted a two-year study of professional development programs for occupational-technical faculty in community, technical and junior colleges. First, Hoerner et al. surveyed 1,252 colleges to find out what kind of professional development each provided to their faculty. Of the 708 colleges that returned the survey, Hoerner et al. identified 16 as having exemplary professional development programs. From the 16 colleges with exemplary professional development programs, they selected six for further study.

The researchers did not find "a single best or 'ideal' professional development model" (p. 19), but they did find that the six colleges with exemplary programs used similar approaches to developing their programs. All six colleges "used planning, established a support structure, and committed resources for professional development, with flexibility being clearly evident" (p. 19). They also found that the colleges shared other characteristics or themes that influenced the quality of their faculty professional development programs:

1. strong leadership that maintained an emphasis on growth and development, and "connected the individuals working within the institution to the institution" (p. 38).
2. full-time faculty who perceived a supportive environment with professional development an outcome of such caring.
3. part-time faculty who saw themselves as significant but lesser members of the institution.
4. institutional and individual benefit from professional development.
5. diverse professional development activities oriented to individual needs.
6. limitations and barriers to professional development were recognized and overcome (pp. 36-37).

In their conclusions, Hoerner et al. devoted considerable time to discussing the influence of institutional culture on the professional development program and conversely the influence of the professional development program on the culture (p. 39). Such influence, according to Hoerner et al., requires leadership that empowers the individuals within the institution (p. 40).

Hoerner et al. identified "level of community" as a dimension of culture. They defined community as "a large group of people within which a core of individuals, the critical mass, determines the real direction, purpose, and missions of the institution" (p. 41). That critical mass of individuals value the mission of the institution, either because the institution's values fit their own or because their values have become reflected in the institution.

Hoener et al. identified a third characteristic of the institutional culture that contributed to developing an exemplary professional development program. The third characteristic was "the idea of nurturing" (p. 41), meaning that the organization and the individuals had a symbiotic relationship which allowed the institution to function as a loosely coupled system in which "control, authority, and accountability can be relaxed and replaced by trust" (p. 42).

Hoerner et al. enthusiastically described how colleges who want to improve their professional development programs could apply the conclusions of the study, explaining:

> professional development programs are one vehicle through which institutions may evidence their ideology . . . . Activities within professional development programs cover a wide range of topics, including mission of the college, student characteristics, curriculum development, teaching methods, advising, student evaluations, knowledge updating, skills updating, financial planning, and computer literacy.
>
> Professional development programs need adequate funding . . . . [And] professional development programs need flexibility. (pp. 43-44)

Hoerner et al. also offered words of warning: "Professional development is an essential ingredient for an effective institution, but, by itself, it cannot make an institution effective" (p. 42).

This study offered useful insight into the seldom considered connection between institutional culture and the institution's professional development program. The strong implication is that the more closely aligned the professional development program is with the institution's culture, the more successful the program will be.

Monoson and Batsche (1992)

In collaboration with BroMenn Health Care, Monoson and Batsche at Illinois State University, designed and implemented a four-phase model of faculty development intended to increase faculty's expertise in the field of aging. Specifically, their model was designed to

1. "increase the knowledge and experience of 10 faculty members.
2. develop, pilot-test, and refine 50 instructional units for integration into the curriculum of [specified] undergraduate courses.
3. increase the number of faculty members . . . who will conduct multidisciplinary research . . ." (p.2).

The study's four phases were

Phase I	Directed Study, which included faculty seminars, development of team study plans and directed study
Phase II	Professional Experience, which included practicum site observation/participation and conference attendance
Phase III	Curriculum Development, which included a curriculum development seminar and instructional unit development

Phase IV Pilot Testing and Research Development, which included pilot testing revised curriculum materials, and development of a research agenda

The four phases were implemented over 17 months. The first phase was a five-day workshop which acquainted the teams of faculty members with historical and current issues that influenced the field of aging. In the second phase faculty obtained “practical experience with the elderly and/or with service providers of the elderly so that practical examples could be incorporated in the instructional units” (p. 7). The third phase gave faculty members the opportunity to “incorporate their knowledge and experience . . . into the development of instructional modules for undergraduate courses” (p.8). Before the faculty developed the instructional modules they attended a curriculum development workshop “to ensure all project participants had the skills necessary to design instructional units which could be validated for effectiveness” (p. 9). In phase four the “faculty members conducted pilot tests of the new instructional materials in the undergraduate courses” (p. 9). Students were given pre- and post-tests to compare what they knew about aging before they were taught with what they knew after they were taught. The faculty members were given a post-test on aging (p. 10) to determine their knowledge of the subject, and they evaluated the faculty development activities (p. 13). The activities which faculty found most useful, in order of most to least useful, were “practicum site experience, assistance by disciplinary consultants, development of team plans of study, one week orientation workshop in phase one, consultant assistance by project mentor” (p. 13).

Monoson and Batsche concluded that their faculty development project successfully met its initial goals:

1. The students in the pilot classes "demonstrated significant increases in knowledge" (p. 14) as demonstrated by performance on pre- and post-tests, compared with students in the control group who "showed no significant increase in knowledge" (p. 14).
2. 50 instructional units were developed in six discipline areas.
3. All 10 faculty planned to continue using the instructional units.

The significance of this project is in the effectiveness of the multi-phased training methodology. The clearly discernable success of Monoson and Batsche's project begs the question: why don't more disciplines offer such training to faculty?

Texas Consortium of Geriatric Education Centers (1992)

> In 1992 the Texas Consortium of Geriatric Education Centers designed a study to 1) establish and implement an in-service faculty development program in gerontological/geriatric nursing for 15 key faculty teaching in the nursing programs at the Houston Community College, San Jacinto College, and at Prairie View A&M University; 2) incorporate aging content within courses and experiential activities offered students enrolled in these three schools of nursing; 3) institute a model, faculty-led course on compliance with . . . rules required . . . for the training of nurse aides; 4) facilitate widespread replication of the in-service faculty development program . . . . (p. iv)

The year-long professional development program for 15 key nursing faculty was implemented by giving each faculty member an eight unit publication and teaching them how to use the "instructional resource guide to enhance their curricula. Subsequent programs were held monthly throughout the year covering the array of topics contained in the learning module" (p. v). The ability of the project to "increase faculty members' funds of knowledge" (p. vi) was "evidenced by their [resulting] Personal Action Plans" (p. vi).

Compared with the Monoson and Batsche professional development project, the Texas Consortium project appears much less demanding in both the design of the study and the measures of success. The comparison reinforces the significance of Monoson and Batsche's training design as a professional development methodology.

Gappa and Leslie (1993)

Gappa and Leslie decried the limited availability of professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty. They noted that "although considerable literature exists on faculty development for full-time faculty, very little has been published on how to help part-time faculty become more productive" (1993, p. 199).

According to Gappa and Leslie, the lack of professional development support for part-time faculty was extremely distressing because "part-timers now carry a significant part of the responsibility for teaching, especially at the lower-division level of undergraduate education" (p. 12). "At many institutions, they are the 'packhorses' of lower division undergraduate teaching. They teach the least desirable courses at the least desirable times for the lowest pay" (p. 278).

Gappa and Leslie visited 18 institutions of higher education, including five community colleges, and interviewed 240 part-time faculty. They found the adjunct faculty eager to talk and "intrigued that someone wanted to hear about their experiences" (p.11). In total Gappa and Leslie found that full-time and part-time faculties "are bifurcated into high and low status 'castes'" (p. 12). They also found that

> many of our site institutions had no formal faculty development program for part-timers; . . . it was left up to departments to provide whatever orientation and development they felt appropriate. Vice presidents and other campus leaders told us repeatedly that the key player in the orientation, development, integration, and evaluation of part time faculty is the department chairperson. They saw the professional development of part-time faculty linked directly to the attitudes and training of department chairs. Training of chairs . . . is conducted systematically at some institutions, erratically at others, and not at all in too many cases. (p. 202)

Gappa and Leslie recognized the importance of department chairs as "the principal point of contact with part-timers" (p. 12) and typically responsible for any professional development that part-time faculty received. As a result they urged institutions to "provide department chairs with more orientation and support" (p. 13).

Gappa and Leslie found that "part-timers generally receive far less support for their work (i.e. research) than full-timers receive" (p. 262). They argued that "it is a terribly false economy to fail to invest in the development of part-timers. It is also unfair to part-timers because they are expected to perform at the same level as full-time faculty in the classroom" (p. 262).

In series of recommended practices (RP), Gappa and Leslie encouraged colleges to:

RP 39 Orient part-time faculty to the institution and the expectations the institution has for them (p. 270).

RP 40 Conduct frequent workshops on good teaching practices (p. 272). Sensitize "inexperienced part-time faculty" to the "needs and perspectives of students from different ethnic and racial backgrounds . . . . The same sort of sensitization . . . applies to gender relations, both in and out of class" (p. 273).

RP 41 Provide in-service professional opportunities for part-time faculty (p. 274).

Gappa and Leslie considered providing part-time faculty with professional development opportunities not only fair, but also an investment that would help satisfy future needs. Their conclusion was pragmatic and oriented to the self-interest of the college:

> The bottom line is that colleges and universities are not going to be able to hire enough good teachers in tenure-track status to accommodate the next generation of students . . . . Investing in [part-time faculty] now is necessary to ensure that there will be enough well-prepared faculty members of the future. (p. 281)

In the face of the strong body of evidence presented by Gappa and Leslie, the question arises: Why has not their call been heeded?

Angelo (1994)

Angelo critically observed that "over the past two decades faculty development programs have become increasingly accepted and widespread throughout higher education . . . despite this tremendous growth in activity, there is little evidence yet of its effectiveness in improving teaching and learning" (p. 3). Angelo offered three possible reasons why teaching and learning were not improving:

> first, a relatively small percentage of faculty take advantage of the programs; second, those faculty who do participate are often the ones who seem to need them least; and third, most faculty development efforts seem to result in little if any measurable, long term improvement in teaching and learning, (p. 3).

Angelo questioned why so few teachers participate in professional development programs, especially when they view teaching as their primary role and are motivated to teach well (p. 3). He did not accept "lack of time" (p. 3) as the real reason for faculty not participating because he said they are willing to "invest great amounts of time, on their own, trying to improve their courses and teaching" (p. 3). He suggested that the reason could be found in

> the model of learning implicit in most faculty-development efforts. It is a quantitative, 'additive' model . . . its underlying assumption is that by

> participating in a number of faculty development activities–regardless of their content or coherence–teachers will somehow improve. (pp. 3-4)

In this implicit model, quantity of participation matters more than quantity. Faculty select from a smorgasbord of workshops, lectures, seminars, field trips, and individual projects on a variety of topics. "Little attempt is made to forge connections or achieve coherence" (p. 4). Angelo cited seven barriers to why "many faculty development programs fail to make much impact on teaching and learning" (p. 4):

1. The primary focus is on "improving teaching–and only secondarily. . .on improving learning" (p. 4).
2. "Many programs try to 'develop' faculty, rather than helping them become truly self-developing" (p. 4).
3. "Many programs do not recognize the importance of discipline-specific 'ways of knowing' teaching and learning . . ." (p. 4). Furthermore, "A 1990 survey showed that faculty instructional goals differ more by academic discipline than by type of institution, gender, age or race (Angelo and Cross, 1993) . . . . [General ideas about teaching are] not translated into discipline-specific terms and concepts" (p. 4).
4. "Many college teachers fail to recognize the need for and potential usefulness of faculty development activities in their own teaching . . ." (p. 5). In addition, "Faculty tend to overestimate their teaching effectiveness not because of immodesty but for lack of specific, accurate information on how well . . . their students are learning. They also lack a comparative perspective, since faculty

rarely observe their colleagues' teaching." In fact, "Most college teachers have had little or no formal training in assessing student learning or in diagnosing teaching or learning problems, nor have they the habit of productively discussing such matters with their colleagues. . . " (p. 5).

5. "Many programs fail to capitalize effectively on faculty motivation . . . . They tend to be motivated most by intrinsic factors: professional pride, intellectual challenge, the fulfillment that comes from helping students learn . . ." (p. 5). Moreover, " Faculty needs are often problem centered while faculty development programs typically are topic centered" (p. 5).
6. "Many programs are perceived to lack intellectual substance" (p. 5).
7. "Many programs are not planned and organized for success . . . . Campus programs lack the planning, leadership, support and long-term follow through necessary to improve teaching and learning. . ." (p. 5). That is, "any program that seeks to change teaching behavior must be for the long term. . ." (p.5).

The solution, according to Angelo, is to adopt a "transformative model of learning–one in which the *quality* of learning matters most. And . . . adopt a transformative *academic development* agenda" (p. 6). He identified three ways "in which the focus [of the transformative model] . . . would represent a significant change from current practice" (p. 6):

> First, a transformative agenda would focus directly on helping faculty help their students improve learning and only indirectly on improving teaching. Second, it would promote faculty and student self-awareness, self-assessment, and self-

> improvement. And third, it would help faculty understand how 'traditional' research on teaching and learning–and Classroom Research and Assessment–might be applied to their particular courses and students. (p. 6)

According to Angelo, the shift should increase quality and quantity of faculty participation by focusing on improving student learning instead of improving teaching. Additionally, the shift would change from faculty providing answers to helping students define questions. It would become more discipline-specific and help communities of faculty help each other. The shift would, through intrinsic motivation, encourage more faculty to be involved. Finally, the shift to transformative academic development would concentrate on adapting promising ideas instead of continuously adopting new ones. Such a shift would focus on long-term quality in student learning (p. 7).

Using Angelo's approach to professional development, the focus would be on academic development instead of faculty development, and would incorporate the concept of learning communities for both faculty and students.

Howey and Zimpher (1994)

Howey and Zimpher addressed the need for "the continuing professional development of faculty members who educate prospective teachers" (p. 1). Howey described previous faculty development as "a patchwork, haphazard enterprise in higher education" (p. 15). He cited "lack of attention to our continuing professional development" (pp. 15-16) as a major cause for the abilities and endeavors of many teacher educators for being less than they should be.

Howey and Zimpher believed that the "dean or director has major responsibility for leadership development toward transforming the organization and culture" (p. 28). They proposed an improvement plan that "can be integrated as fully as possible into ongoing responsibilities" (p. 2). They wanted to enhance teacher educators' pedagogical abilities and

> nourish [the] collective commitment as a faculty to an ethos and a culture–to a learning community– . . . that can also maximize [faculty's] growth as scholars and [their] ability to serve a variety of clients better . . . . This multidimensional conception of professional development . . . addresses the corporate commitment necessary to achieve a *program* of preservice preparation. (p. 2)

After Howey and Zimpher developed their professional development plan, they asked some of their colleagues to comment. The two most salient responses were those of Merseth and Menges.

Merseth named "five conceptual bases for programs of teacher preparation that are suited for faculty development: academic, technical, practical, personal/developmental, and social/critical" (as cited in Howey & Zimpher, 1994, p. 8). She indicated that the effective use of technology would "necessitate a number of fundamental changes among teacher educators" (p. 164). The changes included adopting "a new perspective on learning to teach and . . . rethinking . . . curriculum . . . . [Learning] new skills . . . as leaders in technologically enhanced classrooms" (p. 164). Merseth explained that new classroom technology requires instructors to give as much consideration to process as they do to content.

Menges named "five interventions that are used most commonly to improve teaching: workshops and seminars; individual consultation; grants for instructional improvements; resource materials; . . . and colleagues helping colleagues" (as cited in Howey & Zimpher, 1994, p. 69). He also identified the typical levels of evidence used to assess the value of the interventions:

1. self-reported teacher's satisfaction with the intervention;
2. teacher's knowledge based on tests or observations;
3. teacher's behavior which demonstrate a change in skill;
4. self-reported students' satisfaction; and
5. students' learning based on tests or observations (p. 70).

Menges' opinion of professional development interventions and assessment was that "research does not strongly support our faculty and staff development enterprise. . . . We share descriptions of what works, but decisions about what works are based more often on intuition than on empirical data" (p. 75). Continuing, Menges reflected:

> As a field, faculty/staff development boasts national and international conferences, professional associations, and an extensive professional literature. Nevertheless . . . except for some descriptive work, not much is known about the activities that its members [i.e. professional development specialists] pursue for their own professional growth. (p. 76)

Menges suggested that teachers should decide what issues to investigate and what methods to use. He explained that although "college teachers value freedom to decide how their time is used and how their energies are directed . . . . Many faculty development programs fail to treat the faculty as autonomous adults" (p.77).

The common agreement among the respondents to Howey and Zimpher was that faculty professional development is necessary. Its content, how it is assessed, and the degree of autonomy that should be given to faculty to pursue it were all unsettled points of difference. In addition, Howey and Zempher's proposed shift to a learning community as a means of professional development for faculty requires a cultural shift from the typical perfunctory professional development and assessment methods that were cited by Merseth and Menges.

Oromaner (1994)

Oromaner described the staff development program for all employees at Hudson County Community College that was implemented by the College's then newly-appointed (September 1992) president, Glen Gabert. The president established a staff development office, and a "formal, comprehensive and ongoing staff development program for all employee categories" (p. 4) was listed as a "Priority 1 Planning Objective" (p. 4).

In one year (spring 1993 - spring 1994) the staff development activities included: the first convocation; a faculty orientation; affiliation with, and attending the conferences of, the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) and National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development (NCSPOD); initiation of a small grants program in which all college employees were eligible; regular recognition of employee achievement by the president and Board of Trustees; establishment of the position of Professor Emeritus; several Faculty/Staff seminars; visits to peer institutions; staff development articles in the college's monthly staff publication; sabbaticals; tuition reimbursement and tuition waiver; mid-career fellowship programs; and a staff development survey (pp. 4-5).

Oromaner enthusiastically discussed the new staff development program, but the information that he offered was limited. He gave no information about the college's professional development program prior to the appointment of the new president. He did not explain why the new president chose staff professional development as one of his first priorities. And, most importantly, he did not indicate the effect of the new program on the faculty and staff.

The inclusion of college staff in addition to college faculty adds a dimension to the concept of professional development which requires a college to rethink the content of its professional development program.

Felton and Whitton (1996)

In 1994, when the Oregon legislature allocated a $30,000 staff development grant to Chemekta Community College, it specified that the money had to be used "to support faculty in learning about instructional strategies that prepare students to be skilled members of the workforce and community and to address educational change" (p. 4). Accordingly, Chemeketa earmarked a portion of the grant for interdisciplinary internships to support "the growth of interest in applied academics and integrating instruction" (p.4), and solicited faculty members who were "interested in exploring how to relate what [they taught] to other content areas or to connect [their] course content with that of another colleague" (p. 4).

The experience of Chemekta Community College supports learning communities, but also is an example of how outside interests, in this case the Oregon legislature, can control faculty professional development.

Roueche, Roueche and Milliron (1995)

Roueche, Roueche and Milliron discussed the value of faculty professional development and the importance of including part-timers in it. Roueche et al. advised that "Professional development must be regular, systematic, and continuous throughout the academic year, beginning with new faculty orientation; integrated into the fabric of the institution; and evaluated for its timeliness and value." "Moreover," Roueche et al. continued, "professional development efforts must have something in them for faculty–there must be mechanisms though which faculty are motivated, involved, and excited about participating" (p.87).

Roueche et al. found that staff development is a good indicator of the culture of a college. They explained that "staff development programs reflect the internal and external political realities of their institutions, the level of administrative support and available funds, the institutional climate, and the staff's readiness for development" (p. 88). They contended that essentially nothing "affects professional development as seriously as does the lack of administrative and institutional support, which is tied directly to the realities of dwindling resources that have reduced faculty compensation and travel budgets" (p. 83). Roueche's et al. are consistent with those of Soffen (1967), Valek (1986), and Schuster, Wheeler and Associates (1990).

While acknowledging that the more common approaches to effective faculty development intertwine and overlap, Roueche et al. differentiated among them. They explained that professional development which addresses the needs of students is called instructional development; if it addresses the needs of the teacher, it is called personal development; and, if it addresses the needs of the institution, it is called institutional development (p. 88).

Given the large number of faculty that are retiring, "the AACC [American Association of Community Colleges]. . . recommended that colleges . . . recruit, retain and develop top quality faculty, develop a faculty renewal plan . . . and set aside at least two percent of the instructional budget for professional development" (p. 83). Roueche et al. remarked that "faculty development remains one of the least prominent budget items in the majority of American colleges and universities" (p. 83). What is more, Roueche et al. continue, "When part-time faculty development is funded, institutions most frequently assign responsibility to the department chairs or to department members, which makes any faculty development program a victim of uneven interest and involvement" (p. 83). When Gappa and Leslie (1993) realized the influence of department chairs on the development of part-time faculty they urged institutions to "provide department chairs with more orientation and support" (p. 13).

After reviewing the faculty professional development activities of several community colleges and their involvement of part-time faculty, Roueche et al. recommended:

> In community colleges, which regard themselves as premiere teaching institutions, high expectations of faculty should be accompanied by efforts to train and retrain excellent teachers . . . . All faculty, part-timers included, should be provided with the means to grow and develop as teaching professionals, to be involved in continuing efforts to help [them] shape their teaching to the needs and goals of the institution and focus on achieving the learning outcomes considered important. (p. 120)

Roueche et al. understood the relationship between the community college as a premiere teaching institution and the importance of providing focused professional development for all faculty.

Thompson (1995)

Thompson argued the case for community colleges to provide professional development for adjunct faculty by citing statistics. She pointed out that "nationally, adjuncts teach between 30%-50% of all credit courses and between 95% -100% of the noncredit courses" (p. 1). Given the heavy dependence of colleges on adjunct faculty she raised the "pressing issue of maintaining the quality and continuity in the instruction that will be increasingly delivered by adjunct faculty" (p.5). She proposed professional development programs for adjuncts as "a solution to many of the educational problems that result from the growing utilization of adjunct faculty" (p.5). She cited two substantial sources that endorse professional development for adjuncts. The first source was the 1973 report of the Assembly of the Association of Community Colleges which stated:

> "'colleges should accept staff development as its first-rank priority and give it the same total institutional commitment that is accorded to its other programs and curriculums. In any staff development program, each college is especially urged to include adjunct staff'" (as cited in Thompson, 1995, p. 5)

The second source Thompson cited was the 1990 Middle States Commission on Higher Education handbook, Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education and Schools, which emphasized that "opportunities of professional development and participation for permanent part-time faculty should be available" (as cited in Thompson, 1995, p. 6).

After building the case for adjunct faculty professional development, Thompson concluded her paper by describing some of the recurring "adjunct faculty development programs currently in place at colleges and universities across the nation" (p. 7). These included mentoring programs, preservice orientations, in-service workshops, adjunct faculty handbooks, newsletters, adjunct faculty committees, videotapes, and integration into departments.

To Thompson, providing adjunct faculty with professional development activities is a way of treating them "like the important and valuable educational resource that they are" (p. 6). While she agrees that adjuncts possess subject expertise, she says that "some may lack the pedagogical skills needed to be effective classroom teachers" (p. 6), which is another reason to provide adjunct faculty with professional development opportunities.

Sablan (1996)

When Sablan (1996) described the comprehensive professional development program at Tacoma Community College (TCC), Washington, she explained that the goals of the program were based on the institutional goals of the college, which were derived from the mission statement. The goals of the program were:

> to promote student success and instructional excellence through curriculum review and development and teaching innovation; to increase professional development opportunities for college employees; to build a positive working climate at TCC which includes participatory management, excellent communications, and team building; to enhance institutional effectiveness through planning, research, evaluation and resources development. (p. 175)

Of the three groups responsible for the professional development program–the faculty professional development committee, the classified staff education and training committee, and the management council–Sablan focused on the faculty professional development committee and two professional development components: the Teaching/Learning Center and the Teaching/Learning Forum.

The faculty professional development committee was composed of faculty representatives from each division of the college, three instructional administrators, and a coordinator who received released time and reported to the vice president of academic affairs. The committee generated ideas for faculty development, provided direction to the programs, and served as a communication link between the faculty and the vice president. Their ideas resulted in the "Faculty and Staff Learning Community, the Teaching/Learning Forum, and the Teaching/Learning Center" (p. 176).

Sablan considered the establishment of a Teaching/Learning Center in 1994 a significant milestone for faculty development at the college. The objectives of the Center were to

- build a resource of materials
- provide staff, equipment, and space for researching alternative instructional systems
- coordinate on-campus activities for faculty and staff
- provide video and teleconferencing facilities
- provide specialized computing resources
- provide communications connections to networks
- facilitate a system of recognizing and rewarding faculty
- support professional development activities (p. 176).

Sablan considered the Teaching/Learning Forum a unique aspect of professional development closely linked with the Teaching/Learning Center. The Forum was the result of faculty members' desire to discuss classroom assessment. The discussions "blossomed to include . . . any issue directly related to student success, teaching, and learning," (p. 177). Participation in the forums doubled from the first to the second year and included part-time faculty. The Forum was important because

> prior to the Forum, there was a noticeable lack of a process or group to deal with instructional issues for the larger college community . . . . Both the faculty and administration use this forum as a basis for college decision making affecting instructional policy, programs, and services. (p. 177)

TCC developed a comprehensive professional development program to serve the training and development needs of all its employees. In 1995 the college received national recognition from the National Council of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) Institutional Merit Award for small colleges in recognition of its professional development efforts (p. 177).

Johnson County Community College (1996)

Johnson County Community College (JCCC) in Overland Park, Kansas, has one of the longest running comprehensive staff development programs in the country. "In 1983 at the initiative of the Board of Trustees, JCCC established a comprehensive staff development program that would provide opportunities to promote the individual progress of all staff members" (Johnson County Community College, 1996, p. 1). The program is "designed to follow the cycle of employment starting with orientation, providing skills training, encouraging professional and personal development, and recognizing service and success" (National Council for Staff Program and Organizational Development, conference paper, 1994, p. 17).

The College's commitment to professional development is reflected in its mission statement and its budget. The mission statement says:

> Johnson County Community College is committed to meeting the constantly changing educational needs of the community it serves and to creating an exciting learning environment. This requires the commitment of the entire college community, the Board of Trustees and all the staff. To assure sufficient resources, knowledge and opportunity to best meet its educational mission, the college has committed itself to a comprehensive staff development program. (p. 1)

The budget commitment has apparently been constant since 1983, with one to two percent of the College budget allocated each year by the Board of Trustees for the comprehensive staff development programming (p. v).

The Johnson County Community College staff development program centers on an Individual Development Plan (IDP). The IDP provides each employee with "a means to analyze your own development needs, set specific short and long term goals, and decide which opportunities best meet those needs and goals" (Johnson County Community College, 1996, p. 4). The college calls the IDP "a voluntary method for employees to determine their personal and professional goals" (p. 4). Significantly, "The IDP also may be used as a management tool so that each JCCC supervisor may know and assist the employee to fulfill his/her goals" (p. 4).

In 1990 the National Council of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) recognized the college for "the comprehensive nature of its program as exemplified by the Staff Development Directory published by the Staff Development Center" (National Council for Staff Program and Organizational Development, conference paper, 1994, p.16).

Johnson County Community College requires its faculty and staff to be actively involved in professional development. The requirement has the twin characteristics of being both a carrot and a stick. The carrot is the variety of professional development activities available to employees. The stick is the use of professional development "as a management tool." Either way, Johnson County Community College and its Board of Trustees take professional development seriously as a financial investment and as crucial a element in the ethos of the college.

Summary

Several important points about faculty professional development over the past 40 years can be distilled from the literature review:

1. The need for faculty professional development is widely recognized among a broad range of academic disciplines.
2. Views are mixed about what the content of faculty professional development should be.
3. Most agree that faculty professional development requires an administrative champion: the higher up the administrative ladder the better.
4. There is general agreement that someone with authority to act must be in charge of faculty professional development.
5. There is general agreement that part-time faculty should be involved with professional development activities at some level.

6. The quality of professional development programs among community colleges varies considerably.
7. The effectiveness of faculty professional development as a means of improving teaching or learning has not been sufficiently demonstrated.
8. For community colleges to significantly engage in professional development programs requires a cultural shift from perfunctory to comprehensive, mission-based, goal-oriented professional development programs.
9. Effective faculty professional development programs should be consistent with the mission of the college.

Community college faculty professional development, as a concept and as practiced, engenders diverse views and approaches, all of which may contribute to the lack of constancy in how it is viewed at any given community college. A move toward constancy must start with each community college determining the role of professional development in achieving the college's mission. The colleges would also benefit from having a standard, such as the Malcolm Baldrige 1998 Criteria for Performance Excellence, against which they could assess the quality of their professional development accomplishments.

Chapter III: Case Study Methodology

This is a case study that spans 41 years of faculty professional development at a community college, which makes it unique in the field of professional development research. A long-term study was possible because the researcher's close affiliation with the college as a faculty member, and as a member of the Professional Development Team, provided access to people and records that were essential to understanding how faculty professional development evolved over the years. Yin (1994) called a single case study like this one a *revelatory case*, i.e., one in which the researcher "has an opportunity to observe and analyze a phenomenon previously inaccessible to scientific investigation" (p. 40).

In addition to being revelatory, this study also matches Yin's definition of a significant study, i.e., when "few social scientists had previously had the opportunity to investigate [the problem], even though the [problem] is common across the country," (1994, p. 40). In this instance researchers have identified the lack of constancy in faculty professional development as a common problem among community colleges (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987; Katz & Henry, 1988; O'Banion, 1981), but none have investigated the problem from a long-term perspective to determine why community college faculty professional development has frequently lacked constancy. Until this study, five years (Nickel, 1986) appears to be the longest period of time covered by a professional development study. In addition to covering a relatively short period time, the majority of studies have a narrow perspective of professional development: they tend to be descriptions (O'Banion, 1981; Shawl, 1984; Harnish, 1986; Sablan, 1996), or the results of surveys (Miller & Ratcliff, 1986; Richardson & Moore, 1987; Clough, 1991), or narrowly focused on a topic related to professional development (McCright, 1983; Smith & Schwartz, 1986; Sorcinelli, 1986). By contrast, this study provides deep insight into professional development at a college that other studies have not provided, because it examines both the role of faculty professional development over the life of the college and major forces that shaped it.

This study involves one community college, but the findings may be useful to many community colleges because of the many characteristics that they have in common:

- Most were established in the 1950s and 60s.
- Large numbers of full-time faculty were hired during the 1960s and early 70s.
- Some of the original faculty members were former high school teachers.
- Few full-time faculty members were hired during the 80s.
- Staffing was, and continues to be, augmented with large numbers of part-time faculty.
- Hiring of full-time and part-time faculty has started anew to replace retiring faculty members.

- From inception, most community colleges have had an “open door” enrollment (London, 1989; Roueche & Roueche, 1993 April/May), which allows virtually any individual to enroll.
- The majority of community colleges provide transfer courses, remediation courses, and continuing education courses (Witt et al., 1994).
- By the 1990s, community colleges nationwide began hiring larger numbers of adjunct faculty, enrolling a more racially diverse student body, and grappling with new technology (Cohen and Brawer 1996).

In short, because community colleges have many common concerns and similar experiences, one community college can be extrapolated to represent many. Thus, this study of one community college will provide results that should be useful to many community colleges.

To conduct a case study of this nature, the researcher must have full access to college resources. These resources include key faculty members and administrators who have been involved with organizing and implementing faculty professional development since the early days of the college, college archives, the results of previous and current professional development surveys of faculty, as well as faculty professional development focus group reports. As a faculty member and member of the Professional Development Team, this researcher had access to all of the resources necessary to examine how a community college handled professional development over its lifetime of 41 years.

Collecting the Data

Data was collected from multiple sources including selected administrators and faculty members, the Professional Development Team, the College Archives, faculty surveys, and a professional development focus group report. Using multiple sources of evidence is essential. As Yin (1994) explains:

> The use of multiple sources of evidence in case studies allows an investigator to address a broader range of historical, attitudinal, and behavioral issues. However, the most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of evidence is the development of "converging lines of inquiry" . . . . Thus any finding or conclusion in a case study is likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information. (p. 92)

Following is a description of the process used to collect data from each of the four categories of sources.

Selected Administrators and Faculty

Sixteen administrators and faculty members who have been involved with professional development in official capacities were interviewed separately. Each interviewee explained how professional development was handled during the time he or she was involved with it. A total of 36 years of professional development information was captured in the interviews.

Each interviewee provided an oral history of faculty professional development from his or her point of view. Archival evidence was used to corroborate the events and time frames that the interviewees discussed.

The timing of this study was critical because some of the people at the College who knew about the interplay of events and forces that influenced faculty professional development from the early days of the community college were retiring. The institutional memory about professional development will be lost as those who have been responsible for it over the years leave the College.

The interviews were informal and open-ended to allow each interviewee to offer his/her opinion about professional development at the College and to describe his/her involvement with professional development. A common format was used for each interview:

1. The researcher, either by phone or in person, invited potential interviewees to participate in a taped interview for the study. Each person gave his or her oral permission for the interview to be audio taped, and for the tape to be transcribed and used in the study.
2. Before taping the interview began, the researcher told the interviewee what questions would be asked and how the information the interviewee provided during the interview would be used. The researcher promised to use only the titles of the individuals in the study, not their names. Interviewees were also told that the tape recorder would be turned off if they wished. None did.

Before the tape recorder was turned on, each person was asked if he or she had any questions. None did.

3. No written questionnaire was needed because the interview format and three questions were the same for each of the interviewees:
    a. The taped interview began with the researcher making an opening statement to the effect that the interviewee had been asked to participate because of his or her knowledge of professional development at the College.
    b. Each interviewee was asked to describe his or her career at the College.
    c. Each interviewee was asked to discuss his or her involvement with faculty professional development.
    d. Interviewees were asked to define faculty professional development and to give their opinions about how committed they thought the College was to providing faculty professional development.
    e. The researcher concluded each interview by asking the interviewee if he or she wanted to say anything else about faculty professional development at the College.

The length of the interviews varied from forty-five minutes to an hour and fifteen minutes. The variation in length was a function of the conciseness with which the interviewees spoke as well as the amount of information they provided. The more intimately involved the individuals were with professional development, the more details they could provide, therefore the longer the interview.

Table 1 lists the interviewees by the year they were hired by the College, the date of their interview for this study, and their title.

Table 1
Administrators and Faculty Members Interviewed

Year Hired	Date Interviewed	Interviewees by Title
1962	Nov. 2, 1998	President of the College
1966	Oct. 9, 1997	Faculty member, initiator and coordinator of Writing Across the Curriculum and Reasoning Across the Curriculum
1967	May 13, 1998	Administrative Assistant to the President
1967	Dec. 18, 1998	Vice President for Instruction
1970	June 5, 1998	Director of the Teaching and Learning Center, Chair of the Professional Development Team, Chair of the Professional Development Committee, former College Senate President and first Faculty Senate President
1970	April 15, 1998	Faculty member, former Faculty Senate President
1971	Sept. 29, 1997	Faculty member, former member of the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee
1971	Sept. 23, 1997	Faculty member, former Faculty Senate President, former member of the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee

1971	June 2, 1998	Vice President for Advancement and Planning, former Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction
1972	Sept. 9, 1998	Faculty member, former chair of the Professional Development Council
1972	Mar. 16, 1999	Faculty member (retired), former Vice President of the Faculty Senate, developer of the 1988 Faculty Development Survey
1974	June 18, 1998	Academic Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction
1977	Nov. 30, 1998	Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs
1981	Oct. 28, 1998	Faculty member, former Vice President for Instruction
1983	April 16, 1999	Librarian, former secretary for the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee
1993	April 27, 1998	Faculty member, former Professional Development Coordinator

Professional Development Team

As a member of the Professional Development Team, this researcher had the opportunity to work with two veteran members of the College who have been significantly involved in college issues that bear on professional development. Both of the team members generously shared their knowledge of faculty professional development.

One of the veterans, an English teacher who joined the College in 1967, has been intimately involved with issues of tenure and sabbatical leave, among others. She was not formally interviewed because, until she was appointed to the Team, she had not been directly involved with the administration of faculty professional development.

The other veteran was formally interviewed because of his administrative involvement with professional development. He joined the College in 1970 as a Media Specialist, and was an early supporter of union affiliation. He was president of two governance organizations, chair of the grievance committee, a member of the Faculty Professional Development Committee–not to be confused with the Professional Development Team, which he chairs–as well as directing the Teaching and Learning Center.

As a member of the team, the researcher had a firsthand opportunity both to observe and to participate in the process of planning faculty professional development. The benefits of being a "participant observer" in a case study have been widely recognized. Yin writes that the role of a participate observer is valued as a "most distinctive opportunity . . . to gain access to events or groups that are otherwise inaccessible to scientific investigation" (1994, p. 88). Marshall and Rossman support participant observation as "to some degree an essential element of all qualitative studies," (1995, p. 78). The problem that could arise from being a participant observer, according to Yin, is the "potential biases produced" (1994, p. 89). Yin's concern could not materialize in this case because no one on the team had unilateral authority. The team worked together on professional development assignments given by the Vice President for Instruction. Team membership did provide the unique opportunity to observe the development process and occasionally to attend meetings with the Vice President to learn her position on faculty professional development. The researcher's membership on the Professional Development Team expired in 1999.

College Archives

The holdings of the College Archives date back to 1958, the year the College was founded. They are arranged in chronological order by year, and by topic within the year. The College archives' index lists topics and the years in which the topics may be found, but has no cross-reference. The archives were searched to find information about faculty professional development at the College. Looking up "professional development" and checking the years in which it was listed might have been sufficient, but it was not because professional development is a ubiquitous topic that surfaced as part of the agendas and proceedings in many files under other topics in the archives. Consequently, every file for nearly every topic needed to be searched for each of the 41 years.

When relevant documents were found, they were photocopied and filed in chronological order by topic. The result was 120 file folders of different topics, each containing something about professional development. After the files were organized, the data from the largest and most extensive files were summarized into over three hundred pages of typed notes divided into 36 different topics. The archival information provided context and corroboration for the information obtained from the other sources.

Faculty Surveys and Focus Groups

Over the years (e.g. 1961, 1988, 1995, and 1998), a number of surveys concerned with professional development have been conducted at the College. Other than topic, they have little in common. Each had a different sponsor, used different methodologies, and the results of each were used differently. What they do have in common is the sponsor's desire to know what professional development activities interested the faculty, and some commonality of faculty members' responses from survey to survey.

Focus groups were used in conjunction with the 1998 faculty survey as a means of identifying professional development interests and needs. The focus groups elicited candid discussion about professional development that could not be captured in a survey.

Examining the Data

After the data was collected and organized, it was examined for answers to the questions posed in this study. The perspectives of some of the College's stakeholders and the role of technology emerged as intimately involved with professional development over the years. The stakeholders in this study are individuals or groups, both inside and outside of the College, who have a vested interest in the College and the capacity to influence faculty professional development. Inside the College the stakeholders are the administration and the faculty. The administration is composed of three separate groups: the president, other top-level administrators, and assistants to the administrators. The faculty consists of the faculty members as individuals, and faculty members in groups organized to represent the faculty.

Three different groups make up the stakeholders who are outside the College: the Board of Trustees is the College's policymaking body, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools is the accrediting agency, and the Maryland Department of Higher Education is the State policymaking body.

In addition to the emergence of the stakeholders, the data also revealed a connection between technology and faculty professional development. Answers to the research questions began to form as the perspectives of each of the stakeholders and the role of technology were examined.

The perspective of each stakeholder group must be considered in the totality of the circumstances in which the group functioned. To accurately capture their perspective requires including the background and context of their circumstances. Each of the groups was involved with many activities and had a variety of interests. In most cases, faculty professional development was just one of the competing elements in their universe.

This study documents the events and actions of each group and the impact they have had on faculty professional development. Each group is examined in turn beginning with the presidents, followed by other top administrators, their assistants, faculty, faculty representatives, the Board of Trustees, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Maryland Department of Higher Education. The role of technology is both intertwined with faculty and summarized separately.

Defining Faculty Professional Development

Faculty professional development is an amorphous term. Before studying the concept, it must be defined, and consideration given to the variety of similar terms that will be accepted within the definition; the purpose of faculty professional development must also be examined. This section defines the term and identifies acceptable similar terms. The next section examines purpose.

For this study the terms *faculty development*, *staff development*, *professional development*, and *training* are considered synonymous with *faculty professional development* because, with one exception, they are used interchangeably in the literature. The exception is when the term *staff professional development*, also called *staff development,* has been used to refer to both faculty and non-faculty (i.e. other college employees) professional development (Clough, 1991; Johnson County Community College, 1996). In this study the term *staff development* will be used to refer to faculty development only, unless otherwise stated.

If the term is variable, its definition is even more so. A single standardized, uniformly accepted definition of professional development does not exist. At best the variety of definitions for faculty professional development can be categorized as either institution-centered, or faculty-centered. In general, institution-centered definitions tend to be clearer and more absolute than faculty-centered definitions. Examples of both follow, starting with institution-centered definitions.

Institution-Centered Definitions of Faculty Professional Development

Harnish (1986) defined faculty professional development as

> improving the competence of a faculty member in order to better fulfill the role and responsibilities of his/her position at the college, professional achievement or contribution to the teaching/learning process or education profession in the faculty member's area of expertise. (p. 17)

Hoerner, Clowes, Lichtman, and Allkins (1991) offered an amplified version of an institution-centered definition:

> Professional development programs were defined [for our study] as systematic and intentional efforts developed and delivered at the department, division, or college level for occupational-technical faculty. The scope of this definition covered activities that address the personal development of full-time and part-time faculty in areas related to their general professional responsibilities. These activities included teaching and advising, competency in their teaching discipline and the various aspects of institutional development as it relates to the planning and support of occupational-technical programs. (p. 2)

Meyhew's definition faculty professional development provided institution-oriented specificity:

> (1) . . . specific activities that helped faculty members improve the attractiveness of their courses to improve retention, (2) create proposals that attract external financial support, (3) develop genuine interest in significant institutional problems and a desire and willingness to help solve them, or (4) improve talents and

> abilities needed to render professional service to the end that the externally perceived values of the institution are enhanced and enrollment, which emphasizes the knowledge base, and faculty revitalization, which concentrates on behavioral modification, can bring modifications to the organizational culture. (as cited in Clough, 1991, p. 17)

Richardson and Moore offer a limited version of an institution-oriented definition: "faculty development refers to those activities that are part of a program designed to improve instruction" (1987, p. 21).

Faculty-Oriented Definitions of Faculty Professional Development

Miller calls faculty development "an organized institutional effort to increase professional competence . . . [through] better courses, professional improvement [or updating], higher-quality instruction, and personal development" (as cited in Clough 1991, p. 17).

Fideler explained that the definition of faculty development was changing to extend "beyond instructional improvement activities (teaching skills, media assistance) to include a wider range of strategies that promote faculty vitality and productivity" (1991, p. 198).

Edelfelt and Johnson said:

> In-service education of faculty (or staff development, continuing education, professional development) is defined as any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other teachers after receiving his or her

> initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice. (as cited in Florida State Board of Community Colleges, 1987, p. 5)

Freedman, with Brown, Ralph, Shukraft, Bloom and Sanford, called faculty development "a heightening of self-awareness, an increase of autonomy and a broadening of perspective on the world" (1979, p. v).

Soffen chose a process-oriented definition:

> Faculty development, then is a three-based process which begins with pre-service preparation, continues through induction into full-time responsibility when the individual and the employing institution enter into a contractual relationship with each other, and ideally extends to continuing growth for the individual and the faculty as a whole. (1967, p. xv)

Mathis offered an inclusive definition: "faculty development typically refers to the recent movement in postsecondary education toward more attention to the total development of faculty members in relationship to competence in professional activities" (Menges & Mathis, 1988, p. 254).

Crow, Moomaw, and O'Connell, Jr. defined faculty professional development as "the total development of the faculty member–as a person, as a professional, and as a member of the academic community" (as cited in Menges & Mathis, 1988, p. 254).

The definition dilemma has been raised, not to debate but rather to point out the ambiguous nature of professional development. In 1985, Eble and McKeachie grappled with the term and concluded that "faculty development is both a comprehensive term that covers a wide range of activities ultimately designed to improve student learning and a more narrowly defined term aimed at helping faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars" (as cited in Monoson & Batsche, 1992, p. 2).

Fourteen years later, a retired community college professor who had invested considerable time in faculty professional development reached a similar conclusion:

> Professional development is pretty open-ended really. I think it includes, on the one hand, things that keep you up to date in your own field . . . . In community colleges, I think there's a second important focus to many people and that is in terms of things that people, in one way or another, think will help to improve their teaching. And that's broadening out now particularly into not only different teaching methods, but also incorporating various kinds of technology. (personal communication, March 16, 1999)

In 1997 the Community College in this study adopted an inclusive definition for professional development that describes content, includes all employees, and straddles the institution-centered versus faculty-centered dichotomy:

> Professional development at [the College] includes employee orientation, professional development in intellectual, instructional, and technological domains, team building, recognition/appreciation programs, personal development, and organizational development designed to enhance productivity and morale. (personal communication, November 5, 1997)

Researchers have defined faculty professional development in ways that suited the purposes of their studies. For this study, the definition must be inclusive and flexible so that faculty professional development can be identified regardless of the form or format in which it might appear at the College. Therefore, this study embraces all definitions rather than trying to select one which could potentially cause some facet of professional development to be overlooked.

Determining the Purpose of Faculty Professional Development

Just as faculty professional development has many definitions, it also has a variety of purposes. Numerous explanations have been offered for why faculty professional development programs need to be offered and what they should accomplish. Awareness of the various purposes can serve as a litmus test against which faculty professional development at a community college can be assessed.

There is enough similarity among some of the purposes to place them in categories. The categories that have been selected are drawn from the work of Berquist and Phillips (1977/1979), and Gaff (as cited in Monoson & Batsche, 1992). These researchers developed models for faculty development which identify the purpose of faculty professional development. Berquist and Phillips (1979, p. 6) hoped that the models "can help all of us clarify our thinking about the nature of the enterprise . . . ."

To identify the categories of purpose for faculty professional development, the two models developed by Berquist and Phillips (1977/1979), and the one model developed by Gaff (as cited in Monoson & Batsche, 1992) will each be examined.

Berquist and Phillips (1977/1979) Three Element Model

The three elements in this model of faculty professional development are "the related activities of personal development (attitude), instructional development (process) and organizational development (structure)" (1977/1979, p. 6). Of the three elements, Berquist and Phillips believed that instructional development is the most critical. They expected instructional development to help faculty "become broadly acquainted with a variety of teaching methods" (1981, p. 71).

At first, Bergquist and Phillips included personal development and organizational development in this model only because the three together provide a comprehensive program. Later they placed more emphasis on both organizational development and personal development, which they said had been largely ignored (1981, p. 165). They defined organizational development as "an attempt to help . . . organizations function more effectively and humanely" (1981, p. 182). They defined personal development "as a direct attempt to increase the self-awareness of faculty as individuals and as people in relationships with others" (1981, p. 167).

Bergquist and Phillips (1977/1979) Four Element Model

The four element model included the elements from their three element model and added community development to extend "the area of faculty development to issues beyond the level of individual institutions" (1977/1979, p. 6). The weakness of earlier models according to Berquist and Phillips was "that instructional development is limited to the process level and that organizational development is limited to the structural level"

(p. 6). The addition of community development, which Berquist and Phillips defined community development as "a concern with the entire environment or an institution" (p. 6), shows "how an intervention like instructional development can have impact at not only the level of process but at the level of structure and attitude as well" (p. 11).

Gaff (1975, as cited in Monoson and Batsche, 1992) Single Element Model

Gaff treated three elements (personal development, instructional development, and organizational development) as individual models and defined each of them:

1. Professional development promotes faculty growth and helps faculty members acquire knowledge, skills, and sensitivities.
2. Instructional development focuses on the preparation of learning materials and the revision of courses.
3. Organizational development creates an effective environment in which to implement new practices for teaching and learning (as cited in Monoson & Batsche, 1992, p. 2).

Collectively the models contain four different elements that identify the purpose of faculty professional development. These four elements--instructional development, institutional development, personal development, and community development--in combination or individually, provide the primary reasons why colleges offer professional development.

The literature was reviewed to observe how closely professional development programs adhered to the four primary elements found in the professional development models of Bergquist and Phillips, and Gaff. Following is a cross-section of the results reported by the element of purpose:

Instructional development.

Cohen & Brawer reported that community college administrators turned to professional development when sufficient funds were no longer available to hire new faculty to teach new topics and existing faculty became increasingly "out of phase" (1996, p. 81).

The FACET Commission appointed by St. Petersburg Junior College specifically stated the college's purpose, from which the purpose of its professional development was derived: "As a teaching institution, we exist to educate students. Thus, we strive to commit ourselves to continual improvement through professional development" (1990, p. 4).

Florida State Board of Community Colleges (1987) understood that good teachers deliver a good education. The Board emphasized the use of professional development as a means of keeping teachers current and stimulating, explaining to community college Boards of Trustees that "it is important for institutions to have special summer faculty development programs and other opportunities to keep abreast" (p. 17). Furthermore,

> ongoing programs are necessary for the maintenance of the staff. Three basic reasons for conducting inservice [sic] training for community colleges are:
>
> - student populations change with respect to age, interests, abilities, and ethnicity

- the subject matter itself changes
- the job market changes. (p. 21)

All three reasons are instruction-related.

Institutional development.

The FACET Commission (1990) identified a commitment to professional development extended to all employees as the means of insuring the continuance of a successful college:

> If the questions of the future involve maintaining the quality, vitality, and diversity of SPJC [St. Petersburg Junior College] then the answers lie within an institutional commitment to professional development.
>
> Professional development should focus on all employees, who collectively represent SPJC's single greatest resource. (p. 8)

When Hoerner, Clowes, Lichtman, and Allkins (1991) conducted their two-year study of professional development programs for occupational-technical faculty in community, technical, and junior colleges, they concluded:

> Professional development programs are one vehicle through which institutions may evidence their ideology. When the values of the participants and other stakeholders in the institution are consistent with the ideology of the institution, a positive environment and culture are possible. (p. 43)

Personal development.

The more the value of faculty as individuals was recognized, the more frequently professional development was mentioned as a means of personal development. Early on, Miller and Wilson (1963) pressed for faculty development that would help new faculty identify with teaching and their college:

> college teachers typically enter their profession with little special "pre-service" preparation for the assumption of faculty responsibilities, including classroom teaching, and many fail to develop identification with teaching or with the institution after joining a college faculty . . . . [O]rienting and "instructing" the newly inducted practitioner of the teaching profession must be assumed by the employing institution. (1963, p. 3)

Freedman, with Brown, Ralph, Shukraft, Bloom and Sanford (1979), argued that professional development was of little value unless it considered the needs of the individual faculty member (p. vii). To them, professional development had to be personal:

> By development we mean a heightening of self-awareness, an increase of autonomy and a broadening of perspective on the world. Our concern is that faculty better understand themselves and their social and organizational situation, and our hope is that such knowledge will make them better teachers, better researchers, better educators generally. (p. v)

When O'Banion (1981) used the word "staff," he was referring only to faculty. He specified that "the primary purpose of cjc [community junior college] staff preparation programs should be the development of self-knowledge," (p. 65). He cited faculty's need to understand their role and the role of the institution as components that should be included in professional development programs.

Niagara County Community College understood the relationship between the personal professional development of faculty and the quality of the college so well that they commented on it in their Middle States Self-Study Report and repeated the comment in their Report on Professional Development at Niagara County Community College 1985-86:

> Diversified professional development among faculty and staff is essential for the enrichment of the learning environment. The intent of professional development should be to maintain, supplement, and broaden already developed expertise and skills and to cultivate new interests and directions which add to our existing body of knowledge. (as cited in Harnish, 1986, p. 2)

In Virginia, maintaining a quality faculty and staff became a legislative priority. Hockaday and Puyear, the Chancellor and the Assistant to the Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) wrote:

> Since the initial expansion of the system, the VCCS faculty and staff have been relatively stable. Many faculty and staff members have been with the system fifteen or more years, and many of these have ten or more years to go before retirement. . . . It is, therefore, important to the VCCS that this faculty be competent, up to date, enthusiastic, and innovative. Staff development has been a

> legislative priority of the system for the past two session of the General Assembly. Progress has been made, much more needs to be done. (1987, p. 7-8)

Fideler, the Associate Dean for Teaching/Learning and Professional Development at Massachusetts Bay Community College, supported faculty professional development that would encourage faculty "to engage in self-assessment" (1991, p. 198). That kind of faculty development, Fideler said, requires "a different emphasis for faculty development . . . one that goes beyond conventional instructional improvement activities" (1991, p. 197-198).

When Howey identified the principles of professional development for teacher educators, he included personal professional development, saying:

> professional development itself also must be defined in robust and manifold terms rather than in a narrow and technical sense. It must focus on our growth as role models and mentors, as curriculum designers and developers, as teachers and advisors as diagnosticians and clinicians . . . as well as on our roles as scholars and pedagogues. (Zimpher & Howey, 1994, p. 23)

Composite model (with multiple elements).

The FACET Commission recommended a composite model of professional development for St. Petersburg Junior College, advising the college to "develop and implement a long-range plan for faculty and staff development and renewal with the aim of integrating individual needs with institutional needs (p. 8). The goal of the comprehensive professional development program, according to the Commission, was "the achievement of excellence by every member of the college family" (p. 8).

Monoson and Batsche created and implemented a comprehensive professional development program that incorporated three elements: personal professional development, instructional development and organizational development. "The outcome," Monoson and Batsche reported, "resulted in increased professional development of faculty members, increased instructional activity, and a better organizational environment in which to conduct teaching and research (1992, p. 3).

Florida State Board of Community Colleges (1987, pp. 20-21) used a multiple element approach when they discussed the purpose of community colleges. In essence, the State Board told the local Boards of Trustees that the purpose they had for professional development would determine the composition of the program. The Board explained:

> There are several purposes for inservice [sic] education; each of which requires a different process of training. If the purpose is for school improvement, often workshops or seminars are conducted. For acquiring a degree, credential, or licensure or for professional advancement or promotion, the process of training may be formal or advanced study. For the purpose of retraining faculty, courses, workshops, institutes, and special training may be conducted. If the goal is personal professional development, any of the above processes are possible. (1987, pp. 20-21)

The Florida State Board of Community Colleges warned the Boards of Trustees about the difficulties that arise when professional development is offered without sufficiently considering its purpose:

> Inservice [sic] education has been somewhat prescriptive in its development and has usually been required of faculty. Often the administration has prescribed both content and approach. Although intentions have been good, inservice [sic] programs are frequently quite piecemeal. Often the focus of inservice [sic] education is on introducing new curriculums, new fads, or trends or on beefing up existing programs, typically at the administrator's discretion. Inservice [sic] education takes place on the faculty member's own time and frequently at personal expense. It has been criticized as seldom being based upon faculty need and often being conducted in a manner that negates the principles of good teaching and learning. (1987, p. 21)

For professional development to be meaningful, the college must determine its purpose and incorporate one or more of the four primary elements–instructional, institutional, personal or composite–into its composition. If no explicit purpose, or none of four primary elements are discernable, then a reasonable assumption is that other elements or forces are influencing the purpose and content of the professional development program offered by the college. Because purpose is cardinal as a guide for determining the substance of faculty professional development programs, this study looked for evidence of purpose and the factors that influenced it.

Study Protocol

For the purpose of this study, the College is considered a generic example of community colleges. The identity of the Community College and the names of the subjects involved in the study are irrelevant and have not been revealed.

The validity of the study is based, in part, on personal interviews with 16 individuals who were either faculty or administrators. Each individual was selected because each, in one way or another, influenced how and what type of faculty professional development was offered at the College. Collectively, the personal interviews provide important insight into the role of faculty professional development in the Community College. A condition of the interviews was that in the study, interviewees would be identified only by title.

To maintain the community college as a generic entity and to maintain the anonymity of the individuals interviewed, the following protocol was maintained throughout this study:

1. The community college being studied is referred to either as the College or the Community College.
2. All subjects in the study are referenced by title only.
3. All names of subjects have been omitted from archival documents cited in this study.
4. College archival documents are referenced by type, e.g., memo, dean's bulletin, and by date.
5. College archival documents are listed in Appendix A.

6. The personal interviews conducted for this study are not cited in the References in keeping with the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 4th edition, which disallows the inclusion of "personal communications" (1994, p. 174). The interviews are cited in text by the title of the subject and the date of the interview. A list of the subjects by the date hired, date interviewed and title is provided in Table 1, Administrators and Faculty Members Interviewed, earlier in this chapter.

Chapter IV: Stakeholders' Perspectives

The perspectives presented in this chapter are those of the Community College's stakeholders who have been involved directly or indirectly with faculty professional development at the Community College. Some of the stakeholders exerted their influence from inside the College: they include the presidents, other high level administrators, administrative assistants, faculty and faculty representatives. Other stakeholders exerted their influence from outside of the College: they include the Board of Trustees, the Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

The perspective of each of the stakeholders is presented in this chapter. To provide a better understanding of stakeholders' perspectives on faculty professional development, wherever possible information about their personalities and the context in which they functioned has been included. As often as possible, the stakeholders are quoted directly. In addition to the stakeholders who influenced faculty professional development at the Community College, technology has played a role that cannot be overlooked; hence, the role of technology is addressed.

The stakeholders' actions and the role of technology are sometimes influenced by the events of the time. Following is a timeline of important events in the life of the

College, which establishes historical reference points that provide context for the perspectives that follow the timeline.

Timeline of Important Events in the History of the College

1957 State legislature passed legislation allowing counties to establish community colleges. The county Board of Education was the governing body (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland: Education, 1989, pp. 339, 345).

1958 September: located in a high school, the Community College opened with 12 faculty members, 2 administrators, and 185 students (College Archives, College Bulletin, 1964-65, p. 13). Classes were offered from 4 - 10 p.m. The chief administrator was called a Dean and answered to the Superintendent of the Public School System (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984).

1959 September: sophomore courses added, 22 faculty, 3 administrators, 300 students (College Archives, College Bulletin, 1964-65, p. 13).

1960 June: the Community College "awarded the Associate in Arts degree to nine graduates at its first commencement" (College Archives, College Bulletin, 1964-65, p. 13).

1961 June: "the position of Dean was re-named [sic] President" (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 2).

1963 April 29 to May 2: the Community College received an unofficial evaluation from a Middle States Association Visiting Team (College Archives, Unofficial Middle States Association Visiting Team Report, 1963, April 29-May 2).

1964 November: Dean/first President ended his term of office, which had begun in 1958 (College Archives, Badger, 1986).

1964 December: second President appointed as acting by the Board of Trustees a.k.a. Board of Education (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p.72).

1965 July: third President appointed. Term ended February 1967 (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 2).

1967 February: an Administrator Pro Tem was named. The Administrator became the fourth President in July 1967 (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 2). He served as President until 1971 (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 2).

1967 June: the Community College moved from the high school to its own campus (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 1).

1969 May: the Community College received full accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (College Archives, Badger, 1986).

1969 July: the Community College "was placed under the governance of its own Board of Trustees" (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 1) separate from the Board of Education.

1970 July: fifth President appointed. He resigned November 1972 (College Archives, President's memorandum, 1972, November 15).

1972 Sixth President appointed. He served until 1999.

1975 Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools reaffirmed the accreditation of the Community College (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1980, April 1, title page).

1985 Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools reaffirmed the accreditation of the Community College (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, June, title page).

1995 Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools reaffirmed the accreditation of the Community College, (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 2000, June, title page).

1999 May: Seventh President named.

Order of Presentation of Stakeholders' Perspectives

The perspectives of the Community College's stakeholders begin with the presidents, followed by other high level administrators and administrative staff members, faculty, faculty representatives, the Board of Trustees, the Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, the Maryland Higher Education Commission, the Maryland Association of Community Colleges, and concludes with the role of technology.

Presidents' Perspectives

As the chief executive officer of the Community College, the president also may be considered the College's academic leader. Faculty professional development should be important to an academic leader; however, Vaughan (1986) declares that academic leader is a minor role for most college presidents. A community college president quoted by Vaughan was even more forthright, bluntly stating:

> I thought the role of the president was one of instructional leader . . . . I had to make a decision as to whether I was going to survive. To survive, I had to take on the role of educational manager rather than academic leader. (1986, p. 57)

With the role of academic leader called into question, the importance of faculty professional development to a president also can be questioned. The importance that each president of the College attached to faculty professional development becomes clear as the perspectives of each are examined.

The College has had seven presidents. The first five presidents served a total of 14 years. The sixth president held the office for 27 years (1972-1999). The seventh president, who took office in August 1999, was not included in this study. Each of the six presidents had an agenda. Each was constrained in his ability to complete his agenda. Various presidents were limited by assorted and sometimes multiple constraints, which included money, facilities, and relationships. Their capacity to deal with the limitations directly or indirectly affected faculty professional development. Here are their individual perspectives.

President #1 (1958-1964).

For the three years after the college was founded in 1958, the head of the college had the title of dean and reported to the superintendent of schools who was accountable to the Board of Education. In 1961, the title of dean was replaced with the title of president.

The Dean, who would be named the first President, came to his position in July 1958 as a former faculty member. He had just earned his doctorate and was teaching at a teacher's college when he was recruited to be the dean of the new, unformed community college (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984). His immediate task was to establish the college as an institution of higher education and open it for classes by September 1958. He did both. The Dean had three other goals: have transferable courses, attain Middle States accreditation, and get the college out of the high school where it was originally located and onto its own campus. Of these three goals he would accomplish only one, that of having transferable courses, but he would make significant progress on the other two.

Neither the legislation authorizing the creation of a community college nor the Board of Education gave the Dean guidelines or directions for starting and running a community college. Creating the Community College was a new experience for everyone. In a 1984 telephone interview the first President readily acknowledged, "frankly I didn't know much about Community Colleges [sic]. Not very many people did in those days . . . . They [The Board of Education] didn't give me any guidelines relative to the opening of the college" (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, pp. 1-2, 11). The identity of this new kind of college was muddled nationwide: just what a community college was, should be, or should do was not entirely clear (College Archives, Badger, 1986).

The work necessary to get the college up and running was enormous. The President explained how he handled it:

> The first thing I did when I arrived is [sic], I hired a secretary . . . she and I actually did everything. We wrote the catalogue, we wrote the job descriptions, we hired the faculty . . . we operated the bookstore, we collected the tuition, we collected the students' activities fee, we distributed the fees . . . . We wrote the admission application, we wrote all the forms that we used during the first two years . . . . And we did it twenty-four hours a day. (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, p. 14)

Because the College was physically based in a high school, the President focused on creating a clear distinction between the high school and the College. One way he did this was by not hiring high school teachers. The President explained:

> One thing we always stayed away from . . . which I think made a tremendous difference in our operation and separated it from the school system, is that we did not hire high school teachers to teach in the [C]ommunity [C]ollege . . . . We would have looked just as a glorified high school if we would have been

> hiring [the] high school's teachers who teach during the day to teach the kids at night . . . . That was our basic separation. (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, p. 3, 5)

Eventually, he did hire high school teachers when "it proved advantageous to the College to have some faculty members who were also associated with the public school system during the daytime as somewhat of a liaison between the two faculties" (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 10). In fact, one of the high school teachers that he hired would become the sixth president of the College.

The President had little trouble-hiring faculty for the new college. As he explained:

> The opening of the [C]ollege was announced in the papers and the applications just flooded into my office from day one . . . . It was just a natural in that area because that's just a great place for well-educated men and women. So many people wanted to come work part-time, you know, for extra compensation with many government workers who were interested as well as other people. (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, p. 5)

Even though the President hired people who apparently had little or no teaching experience, he was not concerned about faculty professional development. Quite the contrary, rather than provide professional development for his fledgling faculty, he depended on the faculty to professionally develop the College. He credited them with the success of the College:

> The real maturation and success of that institution was the faculty . . . . The strength of any college is the strength of its faculty, and particularly a new college. I think we were really blessed with an extremely strong faculty who really knew what the thing was really about. And I think that the success of the College today goes back to that original faculty and the times and patterns that they set. (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, p. 22)

The College opened with 12 faculty members: 1 full-time and 11 part-time (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, p.7).

The archival records do not mention any faculty professional development being carried on in the first years of the College. What could be considered faculty professional development took place at the Saturday faculty meetings. According to the President:

> We really had a lot of meetings and we talked about philosophy and talked about treatment and talked about standards. And you know, we just had kind of a little family . . . . We tried to keep up with everything and with each other . . . . We used to meet all day Saturday and just discuss the things we had to discuss. And the faculty were great about it. (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984, p. 19)

Badger, the College historian added, "There was a closeness and a spirit of cooperation during the early years of the College . . . . At the faculty meetings on Saturday mornings, important issues were thoroughly discussed and decisions reached by consensus" (College Archives, 1986, p. 16). Badger also noted that "[the

Dean], his staff, and the faculty were making the rules up as they went along. It was impossible for them to anticipate all situations in advance, so they dealt with them as they arose" (College Archives, 1986, p. 21).

In 1959, the second year of operation, the College enrolled 300 students (up from 185 in the first year), and added 3 additional full-time and 10 additional part-time faculty positions (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 20). The Dean became even more dependent on his faculty. He enlisted the assistance of the entire faculty, both full- and part-time, to handle the increasing administrative load. He established a committee system to "try to lessen my load of responsibilities in so many areas" (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 5, Oct. 5, 1959, p. 1). He appealed to his faculty, "please accept these responsibilities and work together as I know you will and can" (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 5, Oct. 5, 1959, p. 1). The Dean placed "each part-time faculty member on one committee (with two exceptions) and the full-time faculty members on more" (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 5, Oct. 5, 1959, p. 1). As the College enrollment continued to grow the committee system became a more formal governance structure consisting of a President's Advisory Council and Division Chairmen. Even so, faculty were still included in decision making. The Dean directed that "any regulation dealing with the College must and should have faculty approval" (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 19, March 25, 1960, p. 1).

The Dean used the "Dean's Bulletin" to communicate with his faculty in writing. Through the bulletins, he kept the faculty informed and expressed his confidence in the support and ability of his faculty. When he was working on an articulation agreement with the University of Maryland, he confidently enlisted the aid of the faculty, writing:

> It is the custom of the first year Community Colleges in Maryland to ask the State Department of Education to invite members of the faculty of the University of Maryland to the College to discuss courses taught . . . . When they have finished, they write a report to the State Department of Education indicating what courses will be fully and unequivocally transferable to the University. I should like to invite such members to come to our campus and discuss with you the courses you teach . . . if successful and I'm sure it will be, [it] will add prestige to our College, and we can then assure College transfer. Since many of you are on a part-time basis, would it be possible to have this visit some Saturday morning? (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 11, Oct. 23, 1958)

Later, after the American Association of University Women visited the campus, he wrote:

> The A.A.U.W. [sic] visit . . . was most successful . . . . They were particularly impressed with the faculty and their academic training . . . . I feel certain that the Junior Colleges will be the recipients of much more honor than in their previous report. My thanks to all of you. (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 20, Apr. 12, 1960, p. 1)

When the dean began to prepare the College for accreditation, he wrote another bulletin to his faculty:

> There is a possibility that a three-man team . . . will visit our campus sometime during the later part of November. I have been informed . . . that this will be part of a study conducted by the State Department on the progress of the new Community College. For your information the executive secretary of Middle States Association [of Colleges and Schools] is in charge of all accrediting [and will be one of the visitors]. We are one of two Community Colleges to be visited during this study . . . and, as usual, I wish to "show off" our College as an institution that is progressing rapidly toward full accreditation. (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 4, Oct. 21, 1960, p. 1)

Badger (College Archives, 1986) described the results of their visit, reporting that the group of prestigious visitors

> was very pleased with what they saw. However, because the College had only been in operation for two short years, it had not as yet established a very long tract record of accomplishment as far as its student output was concerned. [The Middle States executive secretary] cautioned [the Dean] and the faculty and staff not to rush to accreditation. He urged the College to make a self-study first; to list its aims and objectives; to increase the number of books in the library; to hire more full time [sic] faculty; to graduate more students and to keep more information on them and their progress and success elsewhere before even thinking of accreditation. (pp. 28-29)

The Middle States executive secretary made no mention of the need for faculty professional development even though it was not a formal activity at the college.

The Dean was professionally active and informally he urged his faculty to be. He suggested that they attend meetings of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), and encouraged faculty to join organizations according to their particular fields. He wanted faculty members to join the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges (MAJC) at the cost of $1.00 a year, explaining, "Membership in this organization signifies that you are an administrator or a faculty member of a college" (College Archives, Faculty/Staff Meeting Minutes, Oct. 17, 1959, p. 2). The Dean believed that College faculty should belong to MAJC as "part of their duty to [the College]" (College Archives, Faculty/Staff Meeting Minutes, Dec. 21, 1959, p. 1). He used the Dean's Bulletin to acknowledge faculty who did attend meetings and to announce when he would be attending meetings:

> The meeting of the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges at Frederick on Saturday was attended by five members of our staff . . . and myself . . . . I shall be off the campus all day on Friday May 7 and Tuesday May 10 for the purpose of attending the Junior College meeting (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 21, Apr. 26, 1960).

To encourage his faculty to attend meetings he allowed them to cancel classes:

> All faculty members interested in attending [the AAJC meeting at John Hopkins University] should let me know so that dinner arrangements can be made . . . . If you plan to attend, be sure you inform your classes that they will

> not meet, but give them an assignment to cover that day (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 2, Sept. 28, 1960, p. 1).

He followed through by announcing:

> The following instructors and administrative personnel will . . . participate in the fall meeting of the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges [six names listed]. The instructors listed have permission to dismiss their classes for the day with an assignment to cover the day's work. (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 3, Oct. 11, 1960, p. 1).

That the Dean recognized the importance of faculty professional development is evidenced in that he included faculty professional development activities in his annual reports. In his 1959-60 Annual Report to the Board of Trustees a.k.a. Board of Education, he listed the meetings attended by faculty members and made the point that "a college faculty member, in order to keep abreast in his or her chosen field must participate in and attend professional meetings" (College Archives, Second Annual Report 1959-60, unnumbered page). He did not indicate the number of faculty members who participated in the various activities, and he did not distinguish between meetings attended by faculty, meetings attended by administrators, or meetings attended by both. However, he did include a list of discipline-specific meetings that were attended:

1. American Association of Geographers, Dallas, TX
2. American Association of School Superintendents, Atlantic City, NJ
3. American Library Association, Washington, DC

4. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Philadelphia, PA
5. American Political Science Association, Washington, DC
6. Eastern Sociological Society, Boston, MA
7. Junior College Administrative Conference, Washington, DC
8. Maryland Association of Higher Education, Annapolis, MD
9. Maryland Association of Junior Colleges, Frederick, MD
10. Maryland Biology Teachers Association, Annapolis, MD
11. Population Association of America, Washington, DC
12. Psychological Symposium, Tucson, AZ
13. Society of Heating Engineers, Washington, DC (College Archives, Second Annual Report 1959-60, unnumbered page).

The Dean listed his professional development activities separately, which included attending conventions and meetings, speaking to several county high school groups and county guidance counselors, and publishing an article.

He was elected vice president of the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges in academic year 1959-60 and president in 1961 (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 31). As president of the Association, he was even more interested in having his faculty attend the meetings.

The President strengthened the College as an institution of higher learning not only by encouraging his faculty to participate in professional development opportunities, but also by securing memberships for the College in higher education organizations. By its second year of operation, the College held memberships in:

- American Association of Junior Colleges
- American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
- American Library Association
- Maryland Association of Junior Colleges
- Maryland Library Association
- Middle States Association of Collegiate Registrars and Officers of Admission
- Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States (College Archives, Second Annual Report 1959-60, unnumbered page).

The Dean had no budget for faculty professional development; however, he was making financial arrangements so faculty could attend meetings with minimal out-of-pocket expense:

> The spring meeting of the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges is being held in conjunction with the American Association of Junior Colleges Convention . . . . As I promised you at an earlier faculty meeting, the College through profits from the textbook store will pay for either or both luncheon and dinner on this day. On the attached sheet please indicate to me whether you are going to attend. (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 1, Feb. 10, 1961)

Even though arrangements were made for the College to pay for faculty members' meals, prior to FY1961 faculty members apparently had to pay their own transportation expenses when they attended meetings. The 1959-60 budget had $500 allotted for administrators' travel and $150 to pay for the College to belong to professional organizations, but nothing allotted for faculty travel (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 2).

The Dean's desire for faculty to attend professional meetings without providing funding for travel became a problem so he appointed a committee to study the problem (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Sept. 24, 1960, p. 3). Funding faculty travel turned out to be a universal problem. After a three month study of the travel policies of other area colleges, the committee reported that "a number of institutions, especially the smaller and newer ones, do not have specific faculty travel policies. Many of the deans of new schools have asked for a copy of our study when it is completed" (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Dec. 17, 1960, p. 1).

When the committee submitted its final report, its recommendations for a Faculty Travel Policy were adopted. The nine point Faculty Travel Policy had exacting stipulations:

1. Any amount of money may or may not be taken from the Bookstore Fund for faculty travel. The use of this money is at the discretion of the President.
2. A maximum distance of 600 miles [is allowed] for maximum expenses . . . and travel is limited to the lowest first class accommodation via any carrier.
3. No faculty member may attend a national meeting, under College auspices, more than once during a three-year period.

4. When the President indicates faculty travel, all travel expenses will be paid plus registration fees, banquet ticket, and $12 per diem for room and board. Travel by automobile is payable at a rate of 7 cents per mile.
5. When travel exceeds 600 miles or when the President indicates faculty travel but does not allow full travel expenses to be paid, one half of travel fare and one half of the per diem rate will be paid full-time faculty members, and one fourth or the travel and one fourth of the per diem rate will be paid part-time faculty members. In cases where travel exceeds 1000 miles, the President reserves the right to stipulate the amount to be given to the faculty member.
6. Faculty members who wish to attend any local, state, or national meeting must first confer with the departmental chairman, who in turn will present the request to the President. The request to the President must be made six weeks in advance of the meeting.
7. Faculty members who participate in programs will be supported according to paragraph 4.
8. All expenses must be verified.
9. These provisions will be in effect as long as funds are available.

(Chairman, Committee on Faculty Travel, Memorandum to faculty members, October 27, 1961)

As a result of the policy, one hundred dollars was allocated for faculty travel in the FY61 budget. Considering that by 1961 the college had 33 full- and part-time faculty members, the sum was small, but it was a beginning (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 2).

In June 1961, when the Dean was named President (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 2), he created the position Dean of Academic Affairs. The Dean of Academic Affairs continued the bulletins, which he renamed "Dean's Memo." The President changed the name of his bulletin to the "President's Bulletin." The Dean of Academic Affairs continued to announce opportunities for faculty to attend state-level meetings and to announce his own professional activities.

In his third Annual Report to the Board of Trustees, the President identified "plans for Middle States Accreditation" (College Archives, President's Annual Report, 1960-61, p. 1) as one of the College's priorities. In pursuit of Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation, the President initiated an institutional self-evaluation as a prerequisite to a visit from a Middle States Evaluation Team. The self-evaluation took priority over virtually all other college activities: "To give this Self-Evaluation top priority, I am dispensing with all committees except [those that] do not meet regularly" (College Archives, President's Bulletin No. 6, Oct. 30, 1961).

When the College finished its self-study nearly two years later, a Middle States Evaluation Team made an unofficial visit. The Team made many recommendations, none of which were about faculty professional development. Among other things, the Team recommended that the College needed to be more firmly recognized as an institution of higher education separate from the school system: it needed its own campus (College Archives, Badger, 1986). The College acted on many of the Team's recommendations, but it did not pursue Middle States accreditation again until it was on its own campus in 1967.

The unofficial Middle States Visiting Team did not mention faculty professional development, and the President took his faculty's knowledge of their subjects, teaching ability, and the operation of the College as a given. He encouraged faculty to be professionally involved as a means of strengthening the College's position in higher education, yet he seemed unaware that the faculty–particularly new faculty–could have real professional development needs, until their needs began to interfere with the operation of the College. As more new members joined the faculty, the need for a more formal orientation became evident.

> [The President] stated that we have made definite plans for a faculty workshop next fall, previous to registration. At the time we will have all new faculty members (as well as present faculty members) come for a complete orientation program on the [C]ollege. We have not done enough orienting of new faculty members as to what, [sic] we in the administration, believe is necessary for the smooth operation of the [C]ollege. (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, March 10, 1962, p. 1)

The fall orientation became a tradition that the College kept for the next 40 years.

The President announced his resignation in 1964. He had not accomplished all of his goals for the College, but he had it successfully up and running. The College, which he started from scratch had grown from 185 students and 12 faculty in 1958, to 1152 students and 51 faculty in 1964 (College Archives, Historical Development of . . . Community College, c. 1968, p. 3). Throughout his tenure his goals were consistent:

1. establish the College as an institution of higher education with transferable courses,
2. qualify the college for Middle States accreditation, and
3. get the College its own campus.

The first President used faculty professional development to help establish the College as an institution of higher education:

- He encouraged faculty to attend professional meetings where they would be identified as faculty at an institution of higher education.
- The President was personally active in state and national organizations (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 31).
- He wanted faculty to stay current in their disciplines, but he did not consider the possibility that they may have needed professional development in the areas of teaching and learning. Therefore, he did not initiate an orientation for new faculty until their ignorance of how the College functioned became a problem.

He used professional development as management tool to help achieve his goals. According to Vaughan, this approach is not unique:

> the job of "managing" the environment . . . was the case on many campuses in earlier years, especially on those campuses where the president was the

> founding president . . . . [M]ost presidents showed little evidence of providing leadership to the teaching and learning process. (1986, p. 57)

Given the daunting job the first President had of starting and running the college, he cannot be faulted if serious concern for faculty professional development was a low priority, and his pragmatic approach to professional development is understandable.

President #2 (Acting President) (1964-1965).

After the first President left, the Board of Trustees appointed the College's popular Chairman of the Social Sciences division to be the Acting President while it searched for a new president. The Acting President continued the tradition of "Presidential Bulletins" as a means of communicating with the College's faculty and staff. In general he used the bulletins to report his own professional activities, announce personnel appointments, report decisions of the Board of Trustees, give directions to the faculty, and report the status on the bidding process to award a contract for construction of the College's new campus.

The Acting President maintained a casual, open style that he had learned from his predecessor. At the same time, he was interested in form and formality. His writing style was formal and stiff, even when he was paying the faculty a compliment. To tell the faculty about the "official" visit from a member of the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), he wrote:

> I am happy to convey to the faculty, [the MSDE visitor's] observations that our total program here seems to be progressing in a most satisfactory manner. He made some comments about various aspects of our curricular offerings which I am transmitting to the Dean of Academic Affairs for study by the Curriculum Committee during the forthcoming weeks. (College Archives, Presidential Bulletin No. 3, Feb. 11, 1965).

As further evidence of his interest in form and formality, in another bulletin he wrote:

> I am authorizing that classes be suspended at 7:35 p.m. in order that the faculty may have time to don their academic robes for the academic procession. This year for the first time this [Fourth Annual Student Awards] convocation will be conducted as a formal academic event . . . . It seems to me very necessary that this relatively young institution establish some firm traditions, and I hope that a dignified and well run honors convocation with appropriate distinguished guests and a formal academic procession will be one such tradition. (College Archives, Presidential Bulletin No. 5, March 29, 1965)

Student dress for the occasion was "heel or tie" (College Archives, Badger, 1986, pp. 75).

The Acting President made a significant but unsuccessful proposal to the Board of Trustees that would have had a direct impact on faculty. He proposed that the Board establish "a system of academic rank . . . with a college pay differential," (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 75). The Board did not oppose the concept, but it chose not to make a decision until a permanent president was found.

The Board of Trustees a.k.a Board of Education had never conveyed academic rank to the College faculty. The College faculty were on the same pay scale as the public school teachers, who received pay differentials based on their academic degrees. Four degree levels were recognized: bachelor's, master's, master's plus 30, and doctor's degree (College Archives, Presidential Bulletin No. 4, Feb. 24, 1965). Faculty members could earn more money if they advanced their education.

Beginning to plan the new campus was the major event in the brief tenure of President #2, so faculty professional development did not appear to be a priority. The only recorded activity that had professional development implications was the orientation day for faculty. In an undated memorandum to the administrative staff, divisional chairman and head librarian, the Acting President reiterated plans that had been developed at a May 19, 1965 meeting. The plans were for "the orientation day for faculty and the first faculty meeting in September" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, 1965).

The orientation was planned for both full- and part-time faculty. The morning session consisted of information provided by a succession of administrators: dean of academic affairs, registrar, director of public relations, dean of students, business manager, and librarian; these speakers were followed by a "Presidential Address," and more administrators discussing math and English "sectioning." After lunch, divisional chairmen met with their curriculum advisers. The day concluded with divisional chairmen meeting with members of their divisions.

Between his preoccupation with the development of the new College campus and establishing a collegiate tradition, the Acting President had little time to devote to faculty professional development. With the exception of the orientation day, which was filled with administrative information, and his own trips to various state and national educational meetings, the Acting President did not explicitly promote professional development.

An indicator of President #2's interest in faculty professional development is indicated by the College budgets, as he continued to provide money for faculty travel and other professional development activities. The 1965-66 budget contains four professional development items: cost of meetings, faculty travel, curriculum planning and professional organizations. In a total budget of $616,044.00, the amount allocated for the four items was $1945.00, of which $1200.00 was allocated to faculty travel and $1183.59 was spent (College Archives, President's Annual Report, 1965-1966, pp. 5-6). The amount spent on memberships in professional organizations was nearly four times the amount budgeted, with $95.00 allocated and $380.00 spent (College Archives, President's Annual Report, 1965-1966, p. 6).

The 1966-67 budget totaled $1,167,880.00 (College Archives, President's Report, 1966-67). It contained the same four items as the 1965-66 budget. Funding for faculty travel was increased substantially to $3080.00, of which $3,043.07 was spent (College Archives, President's Report, 1966-67). Less than $1000.00 was allocated among the other three items (College Archives, President's Report, 1966-67).

The Acting President's term was too short to know how vigorously he would have encouraged faculty professional development beyond increasing the amount of money allocated for faculty travel. He resigned September 1, 1965 to take an administrative position at another college working with President #1 (College Archives, Presidential Bulletin No. 9, May 26, 1965, p. 3).

President #3 (1965-1967).

Badger described President #3 (the second official president) as:

> more of an idea person and more program and results oriented than a diplomatic "people person". . . . [He] was truly a very capable, highly qualified man with a sense of mission and vision of what a community college ought to be, and he made studies and laid plans for the direction the [C]ollege was to take, but somehow he lacked the warmth and charisma of his two predecessors; consequently his administration moved the College dramatically forward . . . but without the sense of cooperativeness [sic], team spirit and group sense of achievement that had characterized the earlier years of the College. (College Archives, 1986, p. 80)

President #3 assumed the presidency at a time when good people skills were required. Tensions were high: the college had outgrown the high school, people who wanted to enroll were being turned away for lack of classroom space, and high school personnel were tired of sharing their space and growing increasingly impatient waiting for the College to move out. At the same time, construction problems were delaying the completion of the College campus (College Archives, Badger, 1986).

The College Archives contain limited information about the third President. What is available indicates that he used memorandums to communicate with his staff and faculty and he continued the tradition of Saturday Faculty Orientation Day. A sense of his exacting and precise nature is found in his September 9, 1965 memo to his administrative staff in which he gives them directions for Faculty Orientation Day: "I would like all staff members to attend the 9 and 10 a.m. meetings." He asked for agenda items "which you wish discussed at the 9 a.m. staff meeting. I will ask the following to speak briefly (maximum 8 minutes) at the 10 a.m. meeting" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Sept. 9, 1965).

President #3 was a practical man who erred on the side of efficiency. His efficient, practical nature surfaced when he canceled a planned June workshop for faculty because of "the plans being developed for the next year and the numerous changes which therefore may result, it is believed that a Faculty Workshop would be more valuable if held prior to the beginning classes next fall" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, May 23, 1966).

Instead of the June workshop, the President recommended that the faculty attend a meeting to watch "the film which will be of interest to you . . . [and to meet with the] "Lay Advisory Committee, and the Board of Trustees" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, May 23, 1966). Neither of the alternative activities qualified as professional development.

The third President was professionally active. He attended the National Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the Annual Conference of the Association for Higher Education (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Feb. 23, 1966).

The President's view of professional development for faculty was not recorded. With the administrative and personal difficulties that he had, a reasonable conclusion would be that faculty professional development was not a high priority. Yet during his tenure, faculty benefited in several substantial ways. He supported a policy that permitted faculty to teach at other colleges, believing that it would benefit the College and the individual:

> It is my personal belief that College faculty and staff should be permitted outside teaching assignments when such teaching does not interfere with present duties. Certainly such requests from other colleges and universities are indicative of the quality of faculty and staff [at the College and are] an honor and enhancement of professional image for both the individual and the College, and an opportunity to broaden the College's service to the community. As the College President, then, in my judgement such recognition of this faculty and staff by other institutions of higher education is desirable, and acceptance of such invitation to teach will be permitted

> whenever possible. (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Feb. 7, 1966)

Two other benefits accrued to the faculty during the tenure of President #3. The Board of Trustees approved a plan to grant tenure to faculty after five years at the College. The Board also established the use of academic rank, from Instructor to Full Professor (College Archives, Badger, 1986).

Even so, many of the faculty members, students, and the Board of Trustees disliked President #3 considering him cold and distant. The third President was dismissed by the Board of Trustees on February 3, 1967, whereupon he took a leave of absence for the remainder of his contract, which expired in June 1967. The Board of Trustees immediately appointed an Administrator Pro Tem, indicating to him that if he did well, he would be named the fourth President of the College, which is what happened in July 1967 (College Archives, Badger, 1986).

President #4 (1967-1971).

Badger described the fourth President as:

> [a] warm, kind, stately "gentleman"... [who] brought with him . . . a lifetime of administrative experience and tact . . . . Only a few years away from retirement, he was the man of the hour who was needed to bring a dignified atmosphere of cooperativeness [sic] back to the College and to move the College forward toward the achievement of its important goals. (1986, pp. 95-96)

Badger also lists important events took place during the fourth President's tenure:

- the College moved from the high school to its new campus (fall 1967)
- the Faculty Senate was formed
- the President's Council was established
- the College received its own Board of Trustees separate from the Board of Education (1969)
- the College earned full accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (1969). (College Archives, 1986)

The fourth President began remodeling the College's budgeting and planning systems to more effectively

> compete for its share in the allocation of resources [and] to provide a mechanism by which alternative goals, programs and expenditures of the institution can be organized, analyzed and summarized for presentation to the Board of Trustees to provide them with a more objective basis for making policy decisions. (College Archives, Guidelines . . . FY1971-72, p. 1.3)

Another reason for establishing a comprehensive, long-range planning method was to cooperate "with other State and federal government reporting agencies in the development of [the] PPBS [Planning-Programming-Budgeting System]" (College Archives, Guidelines . . . FY1971-72, p. 1.3).

PPBS was a complex, detailed process that was intended to be phased in over several years. The process started with the administrative staff developing "a reporting system to include all College organizational units" (College Archives, Guidelines . . . FY1971-72, p. 1.3). Simultaneously, each "functional area" was asked to "review its existing program structure and forward . . . a program structure based upon objectives and stated in terms of the impact of the functional area's programs" (p. 1. 3). A Program Classification Structure (PCS) was developed that "each functional area of the college [was] asked to use . . . both in support of its request for funds . . . , and in support of its Program Plan Report" (p. 2.1).

The Program Classification Structure (PCS) was defined as "a classification system that categorizes the activities of an organization according to their relationship to the organization's objectives" (College Archives, Guidelines . . . FY1971-72, p. 3.2). The PCS consisted of seven programs, of which three were called *primary* and four were called *support* programs. The primary programs were the Instruction Program, Organized Research Program, and Public Service Program. The four support programs were the Academic Support Program, Student Affairs Program, Institutional Support Program, and Independent Operations Program (p. 2.3). The system involved numerical coding of each program and related sub-programs based "on the new Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) Taxonomy of Academic Disciplines" (p. 3.7).

Nowhere in the complex system designed to match College funding with College objectives was faculty professional development coded as a program or a subprogram. Neither planning nor funding for faculty professional development were included in the new system, but the President did involve the faculty in the budget process: "The topic for discussion [at the next faculty meeting] will be the budget for the 1968/69 academic year" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Jan. 18, 1968).

The President's lack of interest in faculty professional development is evidenced not only by omitting it from the new planning and budgeting system, but also by the recollections of College employees. One faculty member recalled:

> The closest thing to development here at the institution was that [the Vice President of Academic Affairs] would hold an annual get-together at his swimming pool for the department chairs. And that there wasn't a sense of development. I don't even remember that there was an orientation day, but there must have been some kind of place where people greeted you. But it was, I would say, extremely loose and unfocused. (personal communication, September 23, 1997)

The Administrative Assistant to the President, who started at the College in 1967, remembered faculty professional development day as perfunctory, "[Faculty professional development day] stayed pretty stable. It went [from one] to two days, but it still was around housekeeping kinds of things. It was not strongly focused on curriculum or things like that (personal communication, May 13, 1998).

Even though faculty professional development was not one of the President's priorities, he was responsive to faculty. He planned meetings with the faculty, asking them to meet with him "for two days before the registration of students in the fall" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, May 24, 1967). He communicated both with faculty representatives and with the entire faculty:

> I plan to present to you in as much detail as possible my own position on the request submitted by the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate. Although I have stated my view to your representatives, I believe a direct report to you would be informative. (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Nov. 13, 1967)

Another example of the President's responsiveness and willingness to work with faculty is captured in the minutes of the April 30, 1969 faculty meeting.

> [The President] said that he had received word that the faculty thought more frequent meetings, with the opportunity for questions and answers, would provide a better means of communication between the faculty and administration. He stated that time would be allowed for questions at this and future meetings and that at least one more faculty meeting would be held before the end of the academic year. He also reminded the faculty that he is always available to see them in his office. (Faculty meeting minutes)

President #4 was not actively interested in faculty professional development, however, he did support a sabbatical leave policy. After six years of service to the college, faculty and administrators were eligible to take sabbatical leave and receive either a full salary for one-half a year or half salary for a full year. Because so many faculty members would be eligible for sabbatical leave at the same time, the policy specified that no more than three percent of the faculty would be granted sabbatical leave in any single year (Trustee Topics, May 25, 1970, p. 1).

President #4 had shepherded the College through significant changes and was popular. When he resigned in 1971, the College community threw him a surprise farewell party. In his thank you letter he wrote, "I shall always cherish the mementos and the memories which are mine through our friendly association over the past four and a half years" (Thank you letter, June 25, 1971).

President #5 (1971-1972).

The College was growing. When the fifth President was named, the College had 218 full-time and 98 part-time faculty with an average of 8.7 years of teaching experience (College Archives, President's Annual Report, 1971-72.

The fifth President had the shortest tenure in the history of the college. He was hired by the Board of Trustees in July 1971 and terminated in November 1972. He was a man of ideas, ambition, and action. In the 16-month interval between the beginning and end of his presidency, he reported 90% achievement of the 47 goals he had set for the 19971-72 academic year (College Archives, President's Annual Report, 1971-72).

His notable achievements included instituting the first President's Annual Report to the Community, developing the College's first set of one- and five-year objectives, restructuring the College's administrative organization, establishing an administrative reference library, continuing the PPBS, trying to implement management by objectives, and making major changes in faculty professional development. As one of the Administrative Assistants to the President recalled:

> [T]here was a massive change in 1971 . . . . [The fifth president] thought that special [sic] development was very important. And he set up a series of programs. For instance, I remember that he took all the administrative staff, and I think all of the department chairs and a number of faculty, [and] faculty senate for sessions down in Annapolis with people from around the country. He was really pushing [development]. (personal communication, May 13, 1998)

However, the fifth President's approach to professional development was not universally appreciated. The sixth President of the College, who was an administrator during the term of the fifth President, criticized the limitation on who could attend the programs:

> [T]he other thing that happened way back, and I'll always remember, it [attendance at seminars] was very select. Only certain people could go to certain things. If you weren't like a full-time faculty member, you couldn't go to the seminars . . . . I would assume you could call that faculty development. (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998)

A faculty member hired in 1971 was ambivalent about the value of the programs provided by the President #5:

> I was here the only year that [the fifth President] was president, and that was my first year. We met at an expensive hotel in Annapolis and had an out-of-town presenter. We went through a long, long, string of paid outside speakers who would come. From my perspective they did a pretty good job. They

> would turn me on. Then a week later, you would forget what they said and nothing had happened. It was just a dance. It was an official high-paid dance, pretty much. (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997)

The fifth President did more for professional development than have special meetings: he, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, created the first internal grant program for faculty, entitled the "Educational Progress Research Grant," funded for $20,000 (College Archives, Trustee Topics, May 8, 1972). Faculty members would submit proposals that were screened by a faculty committee appointed by the President. The committee recommended to the President which proposals should be funded and in what amount, and the President made the final decision. What little information that is available indicates that the President was very particular about the grant proposals. In one case, a faculty member requested $10,000 to develop a new business finance and banking curriculum, explaining that he would use his judgment, logic and experience to assess need. The screening committee recommended that the proposal be funded. In an acerbic note scrawled on the proposal, the fifth President responded, "Wow! If this committee passes this, when the whole county is asking for accountability in the [C]ommunity [C]ollege, I do not want any part of it" (College Archives, Note, May 26, 1972). In another case, the screening committee recommended funding a proposal in which the faculty member requested Educational Progress Grant funding to develop and prepare for accreditation of a new program in technical and career education. The President's cryptic response was "If this is needed, why not budget for it?" As an afterthought he added, "I think this program needs a lot more time than what is proposed" (College Archives, Note, June 22, 1972).

The fifth President wanted his own exclusive private time with faculty. In an August 13, 1971 invitation letter, he wrote:

> On September 1 a program has been planned for the professional staff at the Hilton Hotel in Annapolis [MD]. I would have the opportunity at this time to speak to the staff on some of my ideas about the future of the [C]ollege. In addition, we will have the opportunity to meet new members of the College community and to be challenged by some new ideas about education . . . . I have been asked to remind you that the orientation activities for the faculty have been planned also for September 2 and 3. I look forward to seeing you on September 1. (College Archives, President #5 letter to "Faculty Member")

The President's interest in professional development was consistent with his goal of continuously improving the college. In his 1971-72 Institutional Objectives he included a "management development program including at least six seminars or workshops for the administrative staff" (College Archives, President #5 Institutional Objectives, Oct. 20, 1971, p. 1), and he planned to "Implement a full day orientation program at least twice a year for all non-contractual employees of the college" (p. 4).

Under the President's Management by Objectives (MBO) plan, or Administration by Objectives (ABO) as he called it, objectives were specifically linked to funding (College Archives, "Administration by Objectives in Student Personnel Programs," c. 1970). The fifth President did not create a professional development objective which could be linked to the budget, but he did allocate funds to six budget objects that were used for faculty professional development. Table 2 shows both the funds allocated (i.e. approved by the Board of Trustees) and expended for the six professional development objects during FY72 and FY73, the budget years that the fifth President was in office (College Archives, FY72 General Current Operating Budget, FY73 General Current Operating Budget).

Table 2
Funds Allocated and Funds Expended for Professional Development-Related Budget Objects in the General Current Operating Budgets for FY72 and FY73

Budget Objects		FY72 Funds		FY73 Funds	
#	Title	Allocated	Expended	Allocated	Expended
5201	Sabbatical	0	$31,267.76	$80,000.00	$65,201.10
6310	Local Travel	7,980.00	4,113.56	6,338.00	662.92
6320	Conferences	9,445.00	22,574.50	30,553.00	25,233.64
6340	Innovative Travel	4,000.00	4,011.08	4,000.00	0
6360	Faculty Orientation	0	570.36	0	0

The FY72 budget would have been prepared prior to the fifth President taking office. No funds had been previously approved for faculty sabbaticals, yet $31,267.76 was spent. Similarly, $570.36 of unbudgeted money was spent in FY72 for faculty orientation. Additionally, the amount allocated in the FY72 budget for conferences was exceeded by $13,129.50. President #5 obviously overrode the FY72 budget to allow such large expenditures for which no funds had been allocated.

The fifth President prepared the FY73 budget, but he left the College before he could oversee the expenditure of the allocated funds. That oversight was left to President #6, under whom funding was seriously curtailed. Over $6000 had been allocated for conference travel; less than $650 was spent. None of the $4000 allocated for innovative travel was used.

As Innovative Travel was a budget object created by President #5, he included it among his accomplishments. His intent was to provide funds "for the cost of visits to other colleges and/or agencies to learn new ideas and approaches to college administration and management" (College Archives, FY74 General Current Operating Budget, p. 163). This object was no longer funded after the fifth president left.

The fifth President focused the College. He established a more formal budgeting process based on the ABO (Academics by Objectives) method that linked funds with goals and objectives. He enforced PPBS so that the College's budgeting method would conform to state and professional standards. He commissioned the College's first Master Plan, and he established one- and five-year goals. He believed in accountability and he strongly supported professional development as a means of advancing the quality of the College by professionally developing its personnel.

He may have tried to push a relatively laid-back College too quickly into a rigid system of process, form, and accountability. The general dissatisfaction of the College administrators with the President's energetic, sweeping reforms was elevated to the Board of Trustees. In his memo announcing his resignation to the faculty, staff, and administrators, the President wrote, "The Board of Trustees is hopelessly split 4 - 3 and there is no alternative but for me to take this action" (College Archives, President #5 Memorandum to Faculty, Staff, and Administrators, Nov. 15, 1972).

President #6 (1972-1999).

The sixth President was appointed from the College ranks. A former high school teacher, he was hired by the first President of the College in 1962 to be a part-time instructor in physical education. When the College moved to its campus in 1967, he was appointed Dean of the Evening Division. During his time as dean, he made the motion that was passed by the College Senate Executive Board to waive up to 62 credits worth of College tuition for faculty members who wanted to take courses at the College (College Archives, College Senate Executive Board minutes, Aug. 19, 1969).

The sixth President recalled the day he received his appointment to the presidency:

> It was sort of a surprise that the President and the Board had some infighting going on and one day, it must have been about 11:30 in the morning, I got a call at home . . . . They called and said they just fired the president and wanted to know if I would be the Acting President. I'd never been a president before, but the fact that I was running the College at night . . . I was like the second president at nighttime running the whole operation. And I ran the summer session. I had some academic background. So that's how I really got started

and I've been doing it ever since, 27 years. (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998)

The sixth President had definite ideas about faculty professional development. He expressed them freely during his interview. He believed that professional development programs must be interesting and planned: "The program must be planned to be any good . . . . So it has to be a very, very well-planned and organized program and it has to be something that attracts most people's attention" (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998). He believed that professional development involved change, specifying "change for the better, not for the worse. Instruction is so much different than what we had 15, 20, 30 years ago . . . . The good teacher will certainly be willing to change, makes an effort to change" (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998).

He believed that funds for professional development should be decentralized, explaining, "The way we have operated here is if in your own area you have X amount of dollars, we let you all decide primarily what you want to use it for" (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998).

While he believed that faculty professional development should be used by faculty as a means to advance their education, and should be tied to promotion, he did not believe in merit pay. He explained, "I'm not in favor of merit [pay] because there is no way to prove who is the best teacher" (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998). He believed that faculty should concentrate on good teaching first and do other professional activities second:

> what we really want are excellent teachers. We don't put pressure [on] when people come here; we'd like for them, if they would like to, write books, or if they want to do projects [or] invent something, but our main emphasis, when we are hiring . . . is that they give us a good job teaching. We encourage them to do other things, but I mean it isn't that we are pushing them to do three or you're out. (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998)

For the first two or three years after President #6 took office, he severely cut the funding for the professional development budget objects. Immediately after taking office, he terminated the Educational Progress Grant Program (College Archives, President #6 Memorandum to EPGP Review Committee Chairman, Dec. 11, 1972). In his first budget (FY74), he eliminated funding for Innovative Travel (Budget Object 6340) and Sabbaticals (Budget Object 5201). Neither was ever reinstated. In the words of the Administrative Assistant to the President, "When he [the fifth President] left quickly, it [faculty professional development] sort of went into recess for a year or two. And then [President #6] wanted to start pushing it again" (personal communication, May 13, 1998).

When the President began "pushing it again" he substituted Staff Development Leave for sabbaticals. Where the Sabbatical Leave was to benefit the individual, the Staff Development Leave was to benefit the College. The sabbatical was "for the purpose of study which may include advanced degree work or work designed to increase the instructor's competence" (College Archives, Faculty Manual, 1964-65, p. F-3). The purpose of the "Staff Development Leave Program is to meet ongoing institutional needs to improve and support the learning process for the continuing growth and quality of College performance" (College Archives, Faculty Handbook, Aug. 1990, p. 65). The sabbatical and the Staff Development Leave Program also differed in how they were granted. Unlike a sabbatical, which was considered an entitlement due after six years of teaching, Staff Development Leave was a beneficence granted by the President to qualified full-time faculty and administrators for projects of value to the College. According to President #6, the granting of Staff Development Leaves also was "contingent upon budget and funding levels in the College" (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998). Staff Development Leave was limited to "one semester with full pay" (College Archives, Faculty Handbook, 1976, p.104). In the FY77 General Current Operating Budget, Object 5201–previously the budget code for sabbatical–became the numerical code for Staff Development Leave (p. 137).

In response to the President's renewed interest in faculty professional development, a week of professional development programs was reinstated. The Administrative Assistant to the President explained:

> So then we went back to a week . . . . We had a real series of about three or four years where we had some real good programs, I thought because I was responsible for them. In retrospect, I'm not sure they were that good. We had some real authorities but there wasn't much opportunity for interaction and for others to play a part in it . . . . The programs were for the faculty . . . . It [sic]

> never included classified [staff] . . . . The focus was much more on teaching and faculty. (personal communication, May 13, 1998).

Funding faculty professional development proved to be difficult for the sixth President from the beginning of his long tenure to the end. At the beginning he eliminated sabbaticals and innovative travel. Near the end, he faced three consecutive years of mid-year state funding reversions: $822,912 in FY91, $2,768,655 in FY92 and $1,038,258 in FY93 (College Archives, Annual Cost Containment Report, Sept. 1, 1993, p. 2). To cope with the reduced operating funds, President #6 eliminated funding for all conference travel and professional development budgets as one of several cost containment measures[2] (College Archives, Annual Cost Containment Report, Sept. 1, 1993, p. 2). During 1993 the President was able to restore the professional development budgets because the College had prepared for a larger budget cut than materialized (College Archives, Annual Report FY93, p. 3).

Faculty professional development never quite evolved as a strategic priority, not only because of the funding crises but also because little was done to establish professional development goals and objectives. President #6 appreciated the concept of faculty professional development, but did not consider the relevance of long-term purposeful planning for it.

---

[2] Other cost containment measures included employee furloughs, a hiring freeze and a freeze on equipment purchases.

When the sixth President retired in 1999, he left a College that had grown and developed as a respected institution of higher education under his leadership.

President #6 had successfully led the College through financially difficult times. His somewhat paternal management style had created what might be called a college family of mutually supportive faculty and staff. In appreciation for his years of leadership the Board of Trustees accorded him the title of President Emeritus.

Summary: Presidents' Perspectives

Each of the six presidents influenced faculty professional development at the College by the degree of interest that they took in it. President #1 encouraged faculty to be professionally involved, funded a small travel budget for faculty, and started having orientation days. Presidents #2 through #4 continued to support the activities started by President #1. Only President #5 was directly involved with faculty professional development. He created and funded a grant program for faculty and an innovative travel program. Faculty professional development had a high priority during his brief administration. The other presidents supported faculty professional development but none of them gave it the attention that President #5 did. Even when President #6 named professional development as a strategic priority and included it in the College's Master Plan, it still did not become a high priority.

Administrators' and Administrative Staff Members' Perspectives

The constancy afforded by having the same president for 27 years provides the opportunity to look beyond the College presidents' influence on faculty professional development. Other influences came from both inside and outside of the College. Inside of the College, other administrators, administrative staff members, faculty, and faculty organizations influenced professional development. Outside of the college, the Board of Trustees, the Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission influenced it. The perspective of each of these groups will be presented in turn.

Top level College administrators have been involved to one degree or another with faculty professional development since President #1 appointed a faculty member to be the first dean of academic affairs in 1963. However, the rapid succession of presidents for the first 14 years of the College's existence obscured the influence of the College's other administrators. Their impact would have been difficult to determine if not for the long tenure of President #6. His 27-year term provided the stability necessary to examine the role and determine the impact of other administrators and their assistants on faculty professional development.

The role of the administrators in relation to faculty professional development was adjusted before President #6 took office. The Vice President of Academic Affairs had been handling professional development until President #5 overhauled the administration. President #5 split the position of Vice President of Academic Affairs into two positions: the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Dean of Technical and Career Education. When President #6 took office, the Dean of Arts and Sciences was in charge of faculty professional development. Over the next 27 years five different administrators were responsible for faculty professional development. This section will examine in chronological order how each administrator and the administrative staff member dealt with faculty professional development during the term of President #6. The years the administrators and the administrative staff members were in charge of faculty professional development are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3
Administrators and Administrative Staff Members in charge of Faculty Professional Development During the Term of President #6

Dean of Arts and Sciences	1971-1976
Administrative Assistant to the President	1977-1985
Dean of Instruction/Vice President for Instruction	1985-1994
First Dean's Assistant	1985-1987
Second Dean's Assistant	1988-1997
Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs	1994-1997
Staff Development and Cross Culture Coordinator	1994-1996
Vice President for Instruction	1997-present

Dean of Arts and Sciences.

The Dean of Arts and Sciences was in charge of faculty professional development for approximately four years (1972-1976) during the term of the sixth president. From the point of view of another administrator, the Dean of Arts and Sciences did little to promote faculty professional development (Administrative

Assistant to the President, personal communication, March 20, 2000). From the point of view of a faculty member, the Dean's approach to professional development was

> primarily a very patriarchal kind of program where the [Dean of Arts and Sciences] basically decided what was best for the "chiluns." We sat in long meetings with [the Dean] . . . then we'd go to these workshops that nobody was interested in . . . . They'd bring in people from the outside to tell us how to do what we do better than the people from the outside. So there was a lot of "we have to go," and people hated it. (Vice President of Marketing and Planning, personal communication, June 2, 1998)

Circa 1977, the man serving as the Dean of Arts and Sciences was moved to Counseling. At about the same time, the President became interested in promoting faculty professional development, so he placed his Administrative Assistant in charge.

Administrative Assistant to the President.

From the time he went to work for the college in 1967, until he retired in 1999, this individual served as an administrator. Prior to becoming the Administrative Assistant to the President, this versatile man held positions as Assistant Dean of the Budget, Director of the Model Cities Program, and the Director of Planning. He was best known for being the Administrative Assistant to the sixth president, a position that he held for 22 years.

The Administrative Assistant had a long memory about faculty professional development, dating back to 1967, the year that he joined the College:

> Faculty professional development was held in the fall and it was very much like the public schools because it was really modeled after what was done in the public schools at the opening of school. It was a one-day activity and it was called staff development day. It stayed pretty stable [even when] it went to two days . . . it still was around housekeeping kinds of things. It was not strongly focused on curriculum or things like that. In about '70 or '71 there started to be a much stronger emphasis on teaching. Oh, I think we changed academic deans at that time.
>
> When [President #5] became president, because he thought that special [sic] development was very important, he set up a series of programs. When [President #5] left quickly, it [faculty professional development] sort of went into recess for a year or two. And then [President #6] wanted to start pushing it again. So then we went back to a week.
>
> We had a real series of about three or four years where we had some real good programs; I thought so because I was responsible for them. In retrospect, I'm not sure they were that good. We had some real authorities, but there wasn't much opportunity or interaction for others to play a part in it. It was much more than just lectures for a single day . . . . Generally we would have other activities built around it . . . . The program was for the faculty . . . it never included classified [staff] . . . . They set up their own professional

> development activities program through the personnel office. I think we really never paid any attention to the classified staff in the early days. The focus was much more on teaching and faculty. (personal communication, May 13, 1998)

In planning for faculty professional development, the Administrative Assistant explained that he always would meet with the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee to go over the program that he was proposing. He said that they were very important and very intimately involved for four or five years, but eventually he stopped meeting with them because,

> I had trouble getting to meet with the committee. One thing I think, quite honestly, that they felt that I was doing the proposal for them. For a couple of years, I know, we tried getting together to talk about it ahead of time before I had put together a program, and [the program] got lost in rhetoric. (personal communication, May 13, 1998)

By the middle 1970s, few new faculty members were being hired. By the late 1970s, the emphasis on faculty professional development began to diminish at the College. "Then I think I let it slip because we thought we had mature faculty," the Administrative Assistant said simply (personal communication, May 13, 1998).

The Administrative Assistant to the President allocated money from his budget to support faculty professional development activities because professional development *per se* had never been formally included in the college budget with its own budget line. The Administrative Assistant offered his explanation for why professional development did not have a budget line:

> I think it was because it grew like Topsy. It just grew that way. For instance, when I had professional development I had two small lines that really took care of fall orientation, we called it then. We called it orientation because those first few years [1973-1975] we were hiring new faculty, [hence] faculty orientation. (personal communication, May 13, 1998)

Even though faculty professional development did not have a budget line, the Administrative Assistant believed that funds used for faculty development were dispersed throughout the College operating budget, so he decided to locate the funds and centralize money for professional development. His efforts were frowned upon:

> At one time I made a proposal to the President's staff that we take all of the professional development funds and that kind of thing and put it together. That was not well received.
>
> I went laboriously through the budget book and took every travel [item], local and distant, every item that I thought could be called professional development [and] put it together. I found, I think, $300,000 and I thought that it could be put to better use if it were put in the central fund. It meant that department chairs lost their authority over it. It was quickly killed. I dropped the whole thing: nobody was going to agree with me. (personal communication, May 13, 1998)

When the administration was reorganized in 1985, the Administrative Assistant to the President was named the Dean for Advancement and Planning. At that point he turned faculty professional development over to the Dean of Instruction, who according to the Administrative Assistant, took a very different approach:

> [Faculty professional development] was not significant in his [the Dean's] mind. He usually turned it over to one of his assistants.
>
> When I had it, I had a small budget line. But when it went to [the Dean of Instruction], it seemed to lose its character financially. (personal communication, May 13, 1998)

Dean of Instruction/Vice President for Instruction.

The Dean of Instruction held the position from 1985 to 1997. In 1994, his title was changed to Vice President for Instruction. In 1997, he resigned the position to rejoin the faculty.

During an interview, the former Vice President commented on the idea of centralizing faculty professional development funds:

> There has been a lot of argument about where this money should be. For the past several years, I think there has been an attempt to centralize it. The classified staff professional program has always been centralized in the personnel office. On the other hand, I don't know that that has been any more successful. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

He explained why the college did not have a budget line for faculty professional development:

> The budget is constructed in such a way that there are funds which are available in particular lines with [professional development related] titles. For example, as you know, there are divisions with travel budgets and departments with travel budgets. The purpose of the travel budget is, in fact, professional development because it is primarily geared toward conference travel. So there are specific areas that we identify as professional development, but if the question is, is there a pot of money somewhere in the College that is setting there specifically geared for professional development, the answer is no. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

When asked if he thought that centralized the funds for faculty professional development would help legitimize the concept, he said, "The difficulty is that you have to define the objective of professional development. And, I'm not sure there is total agreement on that" (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998).

The former Vice President did not believe there should be a faculty professional development fund:

> The experiments that we have done with trying to create a professional development program that fits all have been largely unsuccessful. You remember that up until this past year [1997] we had one professional development day with everyone doing different things. From what I have heard listening to people, I think most people feel it has not been a particular success simply because everyone has different needs. And, frankly the most popular segment of that professional development day was when they had the

> retirement seminar. So, you have one group of people who want computer skills. You have another group of people who want communications skills. It probably is better to have a bottoms-up type of approach. I've reached that conclusion after many years. I have probably argued the other side of the issue in the past, but I think at this point having been through it, I think probably it really should be a bottoms-up . . . allocating funds at the lowest possible level, department, division; certainly not collegewide. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998).

The former Vice President was willing to let faculty decide what their professional developments needs were. He offered his philosophy of professional development beginning with his definition, which accurately reflected his attitude about how faculty professional development should be handled:

> [Professional development is] a process that is designed to enhance competency or capabilities in the individual's area of responsibility. Now, it has a longer-term component in a sense, that those areas of responsibility may change over time and so longer-term professional development would try to take into account a broader range of capabilities . . . . I think there is both a long-term and a short-term component. The question really [is] related to faculty. I don't think you can truly answer the question [about what professional development should be] until you agree on the characteristics you're expecting the faculty member to exhibit. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

He believed that faculty would, could, and should handle their own professional development, and he believed that they do:

> There's a lot of professional development that occurs below the radar screen . . . . My perception is that there is a lot going on. I don't know that we have any less professional development than any other institution that I know of. I think it may just have less of a mandate from above. I think it is less well-defined, that doesn't mean that it is any less present. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

He characterized the administration's view of professional development as a "supportive attitude in a grass roots kind of way." Elaborating, he said:

> I don't think there has been an institutional professional development plan or an instructional area professional plan. I think that the model mostly has been to push professional development down to the lowest level where it can feasibly occur . . . . Now this isn't published as a College professional development plan, but it certainly is going on. I think it always has. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

He agreed with the administration's view that professional development activities should not be centralized:

> I, personally, have always been in favor of professional development occurring at the grassroots. Obviously there's disagreement among people, but that is simply where I stand. I think–although it's harder to point to specific

> accomplishments–nevertheless, I think, in many ways it's more effective. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

The former Dean of Instruction strenuously objected to the thought of mandating professional development, declaring:

> In a college, an institution of higher education, faculty are professionals, administrators are professionals . . . . I think in that kind of environment, an institution should be very careful about mandating what they consider to be the particular route toward enhancing capabilities. I think to some extent that it undermines professionalism. And I think it takes a very wise individual to figure out exactly what that strategy could be. Frankly my experience is that I know I'm not wise enough to do it, and so I have some doubts that other people are wise enough to do it. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

He considered "the most unhappy places" as those colleges "where some of these decisions are mandated," and he favored surveys asking faculty members what kind of professional development they wanted or needed. He questioned the value of the College offering workshops in such things as how to use computer software, explaining:

> I think the danger is that you can offer workshops that definitely provide skills, the question is whether the skills are critical skills. I hardly think that the student success rate in chemistry is going to depend on whether or not I master [Microsoft®] PowerPoint®.

> I think there really needs to be a little more of an emphasis on exchanging information about pedagogical models and techniques . . . . [T]he missing piece at this institution is . . . the show-and-tell piece. I think we need to have some idea of what impacts different techniques have and hopefully there will be some things that will help us.
>
> We have some serious problems in terms of the learning environment that we have and we know we have to do better. So the question is, how should we go about doing it? I think everyone ought to at least have some idea of how to incrementally improve what they are doing . . . . You have to try things. That I think, to me, is professional development. We need to be researchers. (personal communication, Oct. 28, 1998)

Consistent with his belief that individual faculty members should work out their own professional development needs and in support of individual faculty development, when he was Vice President for Instruction, he distributed a professional development brochure to each faculty member. The brochure outlined all of the instructional, intellectual, individual, and institutional faculty development opportunities provided by the College. In his memorandum that accompanied the brochure, he encouraged faculty members to "Please take full advantage of these programs–they were designed to meet your expressed needs and interests" (College Archives, Vice President for Instruction, Memorandum to All Faculty, Feb. 24, 1992). The "expressed needs and interests" were the outgrowth of a "DACUM-Based [Develop A CUrriculuM] Model of Faculty Excellence developed by the Faculty

Professional Development Committee to Support an integrated program of Faculty Development" (College Archives, DACUM-Based Model of Faculty Excellence, 1992).

Under the Vice President for Instruction, group professional development for faculty was limited to a two-day orientation held twice a year. In keeping with his disinterest in group professional development, the Vice President gave the responsibility for the biennial two-day orientations to his assistants. Eventually, in 1994, he removed faculty professional development from his area of responsibility by turning it over to the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs.

Assistants to the Vice President for Instruction.

As part of the 1985 administrative reorganization, the Vice President for Instruction "negotiated a support position from the regular College budget . . . . It was designed to be an administrative position for 11 or 12 months, but occupied by a senior faculty member" (Vice President's first Assistant, personal communication, Mar. 8, 2000).

The Vice President assigned professional development oversight to his first Assistant. The Assistant worked with the Staff Development Coordinator, whose job was to provide professional development opportunities for all College employees, and with the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee, which was concerned only with faculty development.

The first Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction said that she was "in the enviable position of being the first person to occupy a new position and hence had the luxury of forming it in my own image" (personal communication, Mar. 8, 2000). She believed that both staff and faculty development had a direct impact on the institution.

Her goal was to raise the profile of staff development and elevate the professional development principle. She sent both faculty and staff to conferences; she sought funding for faculty development; and, through the Vice President for Instruction, she was able to get release time for faculty members to work on professional development projects.

After working as the Vice President's Assistant for two years, she left the College to become president of a community college in another state (personal communication, Mar. 29, 2000).

The second Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction also was recruited from the faculty ranks. She originally was brought into the administration to coordinate faculty professional development that was funded by a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) grant. When the first Assistant to the Vice President left, the coordinator of NEH faculty development became the Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction and continued working with faculty development.

The second Assistant developed a model related to the growth of the professional faculty member. Her model integrated four elements–intellectual, institutional, individual, and instructional–that she identified as essential to a professional development plan. Of the elements, she believed that intellectual, which she called "the scholarly piece" (personal communication, June 2, 1998), was missing from the College. In support of her position she summarized the lack of faculty scholarly accomplishment:

> They [faculty] came in with a Master of Arts [as long ago as] 1972, 1969, whatever. They don't keep up on the literature. They don't understand the rigor of scholarship. They teach their classes well, but frankly some of the things they teach changed 20 years ago . . . . They're great teachers . . . . But they're not part of academia. (personal communication, June 2, 1998)

As a faculty member hired in 1971, she was critical of how faculty development was handled in the early days at most community colleges when faculty had no voice in what would be presented:

> They [the administration] didn't know what to do and they had to do something. So whatever was "hot," whatever was in the literature, they brought a speaker in and nobody cared. That's the early history of it [faculty professional development] here. (personal communication, June 2, 1998)

She saw the Title III NEH grant for faculty development as a means to reverse the old way that faculty professional development had been handled and make it faculty-centered. She was soon disillusioned, however, when she discovered that "the patriarchs [administrators] had turned it over to the people, but the patriarchs were not supporting it . . . . It became a disconnect in resources" (personal communication, June 2, 1998). For her the lack of support could be summarized in one word, "territory." She saw territory as an issue because of insufficient resources, explaining, "If I only have five bucks, why should I give it to someone else. If there's $50,000 I know I'm going to get some of the benefit" (personal communication, June 2, 1998). She used the difference between funding for classified staff professional development and funding for professional development for administrators to make her point. Classified staff professional development is funded and controlled by Personnel, which is very reluctant to give it up. The administrators have neither a professional development program, nor the funds to establish one.

In addition to insufficient resources, she believed that the lack of administrative leadership not only was an impediment to professional development, but also made her position as the Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction more difficult. She explained that the [Vice President]was very introverted and very self-motivated, but not someone who was "there to lead the train." She respected him as "marvelous and brilliant," but understood that active involvement in developing a faculty professional development program "wasn't his thing." He left it to her, gave her a little money, but did not give her any authority. "He was very supportive, but he didn't provide the leadership" (personal communication, June 2, 1998). The end result was that she had difficulty getting cooperation from faculty. She believed her effort to obtain cooperation was further compromised because "I did faculty evaluations . . . . I think having the same person do both is wrong . . . . The two became linked and that was not good" (personal communication, June 2, 1998).

She did not believe the President was interested in promoting professional development. She believed that because President #6 was unusually skilled at hiring talented, capable people that he did not think they needed professional development.

During the time she was responsible for faculty professional development programs, she worked with the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee and a faculty member who had been given full release time to concentrate on staff development. She felt little was gained from meeting with the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee because as volunteers, she thought they did not adequately represent the faculty. She believed that they "weren't truly representative . . . . They had great ideas, but they were their ideas not the faculty's ideas" (personal communication, June 2, 1998). On the other hand, she enjoyed working with the staff development coordinator to promote professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.

On the whole the second Assistant believed that, in spite of her perception of lack of scholarship among the faculty, the College was doing well. "The average classroom was being taught brilliantly. The average faculty member was very well trained" (personal communication, June 2, 1998). She did not say to what extent the faculty's teaching ability was attributable to professional development.

In 1997, the second Administrative Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction was selected to be the Vice President for Advancement and Planning.

Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs.

In 1999 the Affirmative Action officer celebrated her 21st anniversary of working for the College. She started as the Director of Financial Aid, was promoted to Dean of Enrollment Management and Financial Aid, and then in 1988 she became the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs.

In 1994, when the Vice President for Instruction announced that he did not want to be involved in professional development, it was turned over to her. She explained:

> When there is something that somebody else doesn't want to do, it normally gets passed on to an assistant. Okay, so I happened to be the person who got it this time . . . and I said, "okay, that's fine" because at the time I was also co-chairing the Cross-Cultural Education Advisory Council. So it was a good mesh. There were some things we wanted to do with the Council and it [sic] involved professional development . . . so I took on that responsibility. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

As soon as the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs assumed responsibility for faculty professional development, she advertised for and hired a faculty member to become the Coordinator of the Staff Development Advisory Committee and the Cross-Cultural Education Advisory Council. The faculty member was "paid" in release time for fall 1994 and spring 1995.

In fall 1994 a College-wide Staff Development Advisory Committee representing faculty, administrators, and classified staff was created. The Staff Development Advisory Committee had five charges:

- determine the overall goals for staff development on campus
- review and make recommendations on specific components of staff development
- solicit and coordinate input from constituent groups
- assess the program evaluation
- review and make recommendations regarding future expenditures for staff development. (College Archives, Chairman's Memorandum to Staff Development Advisory Committee, Aug. 31, 1994)

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs held the Coordinator responsible for working with the committee:

> She [the Coordinator] was responsible for making sure that whatever activities were planned that all the logistical arrangements were made and taken care of and the speakers, and what have you were contracted . . . . My secretary worked as almost an assistant to the Coordinator. So we basically provided the Coordinator with clerical support. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs discussed how faculty professional development programs were put together: there were theme topics, and then there were some sessions in the areas of technology and human relations. Her approach to assembling a program for professional development day was to:

> think about what the council had identified as needs of the faculty and really all of the constituencies because there was a survey that was done. And based on that survey, people had an opportunity to indicate what they thought their training needs were . . . . Those were the areas that we tried to hone in on as we did the professional development day. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

The College began holding a staff development day during the semester. "For two years, I believe, we had an actual staff development day, where the College was closed and we just had workshops" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998). According to the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs, the idea for having a staff development during the semester came from the Coordinator and the Staff Advisory Committee, as did decisions about the professional development activities planned for the day. The majority of professional development was done in workshops. The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs explained how the day was scheduled:

> When there were not enough workshops . . . in a given time slot, then [the Coordinator] and I would do some brainstorming. And I would have sheets of papers hanging around my wall, looking at the time slots and making sure that the workshops actually spoke to the needs of all of the different constituency groups. And where I saw a hole, then either [the Coordinator] or I started calling people in Continuing Education saying, "Okay, this is the workshop we would like to do. We need for you to find someone. We need a speaker.

> We did stuff like that. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

Neither the advisory council nor the Coordinator had their own budgets. The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs allocated $5,000 per semester to the Coordinator. "I had money that [the Coordinator]used through my budget. The bulk of the money always went for the fall staff development day" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998).

Professional development money was budgeted for the administrative staff and classified staff, but aside from the small amount of travel money allotted to the academic divisions, there was no budget line for faculty professional development. The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs explained how the funding was handled: "Because of the minuscule amount of money that's available per faculty member, you've got to find programs where you can reach the masses . . . and get the most for your buck" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998). She said the issue of money for [faculty] development was often discussed, as in "Well, who's going to pay for [faculty] development? How much money is there?" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998). Then she explained the problem:

> There has not been any real fine distinction about whose responsibility it is for [faculty] development because it is spread all around the institution . . . . It's in the divisions and it's designated as development . . . . And it's in there based on a formula dealing with the number of full time faculty members that there are in that division. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs believed that the responsibility for faculty professional development needed to be in the Division of Instruction. She defined professional development as "a program that allows individuals to receive training or re-training in areas that affect their livelihood, as well as the livelihood and existence of the institution" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998). She had some thoughts about what professional development the faculty needed and realized that some faculty members would not be responsive to her ideas.

> The instructional area is where our faculty happens to be housed. And the faculty are the ones who affect the success of our students. We need to make sure that faculty are trained in a lot of different areas, and that they're kept abreast of technological changes. I think that they also need to be kept abreast of human relations skills . . . . But, you know there are a lot of our faculty who could care less about those kinds of topics. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

Although the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs thought that professional development should be under the Vice President for Instruction, she was aware of other models, which she thought should be considered:

> I think that every institution needs to have a professional development component. Some of the larger institutions tend to have a staff development component under their human resources umbrella. And it consists of an area that works with all of the employees. There tends to be a faculty person in that area who is there on release time who speaks to faculty needs and helps to

> structure programs . . . . Some institutions actually have a complete operating budget for that component . . . . I visited Brevard Community College down in Florida. And they have a staff development office as part of their human resources area. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs discussed many of her ideas about professionally developing faculty. She believed that all faculty need to learn new ways of reaching students. Of the students she said:

> Their learning styles are so different. Because they are so different, we need to learn new ways to impart the same information that we have imparted in the past. There are a lot of areas where the information is the same, but the learners are so different that they are not ready and not willing to accept the exchange of that information if we continue to give it in the same vein that we've given it in the past. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

She thought the solution to keeping senior faculty current in their field could be found by having an experienced or "seasoned" faculty members, as she calls them, mentoring inexperienced or new faculty members. "I think that the seasoned faculty person is going to be more willing to take suggestions and feedback from this new person because they've got this give-and-take situation going on. One is helping the other" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998).

She had mixed feelings about whether or not faculty should be required to engage in professional development: "One part of me says that it needs to be voluntary. But then there is another part of me that says there are certain things that must be mandatory. I think that we have moved away from the mandatory" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998). She recalled that

> at one point, faculty members' contracts began one week prior to classes beginning, so therefore, you were required to be on campus. And . . . the first day back and you were supposed to be in that meeting . . . . [Roll was even taken for awhile, but then stopped.] I don't know how [roll taking] started and stopped . . . . But it's something that we probably need to go back to because sometimes it's embarrassing. You look at the opening session and there are very few faculty members there. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs also speculated on changes that she expected to take place at the College:

> As we move toward the next millennium, I think that we will see some restructuring of the institution . . . we are getting a new president. We have had 26, moving into 27 years with [President #6]. He's been good for the College. However, it's time for us to bring someone in who has some fresh thoughts about some different things. And it is very possible that professional development rises to the top . . . of that new president's agenda. We could then be looking at something that I mentioned a little earlier in terms of, first of all, a department of human resources. Under that department an area of [what's] normally called staff development, would have component parts. I kind of see that happening if not within the first year of the new presidency, at least within the first three. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

When she heard that new faculty especially wanted a time at the beginning of the semester to socialize, she agreed:

> I think that in the earlier years, we did a better job of meeting and greeting and introducing people. It has . . . been at least five years since they introduced the senior administrators on the opening of campus. So you have faculty members who haven't a clue . . . . They don't know who those folks are. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

In response to a question about why administrators and others were not introduced, she explained:

> I think that over the years [the Vice President for Instruction] didn't want to be that much involved with professional development. I think those are changes that [the new Vice President for Instruction] will look at . . . . [Also] a new president, I think, will be more cognizant of the need for people to know who others are on campus. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

She saw two limitations to faculty professional development at the College. One was the lack of money, the other was the unwillingness of some faculty to be involved. Of the faculty, she said:

> You will find that there are some people who really buy into it and participate and then you have some folks who are really just die-hards. Nothing will change them. Nothing will move them. And so they don't want to get involved. So I think that we should be encouraged by . . . the large cadre of

> individuals who will participate in professional development. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs was in charge of faculty professional development until a new Vice President for Instruction was named in 1997. The new Vice President "really felt strongly that it needed to be in the instructional area. And I [Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs] did too" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998). So faculty professional development was returned to the Office of the Vice President for Instruction.

The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs appreciated the faculty professional development program initiated by the new Vice President for Instruction:

> I think that it's a great direction for us to be moving in, and I see that continuing because within the next five years there will be such a turnover in the faculty that we'll have a lot more new faculty members coming in. I think they are going to be much younger. Many of them are going to be fresh out of graduate school programs. This may be their first real attempt at full-time teaching other than being TAs. And they are going to need some direction. I think that their needs are going to be somewhat different from the needs of some of the seasoned faculty members. But the thing is not to negate the fact that even the seasoned faculty members need some rejuvenation. Even to the extent that if we were to pair our seasoned faculty members as mentors with our new faculty members, I think it's a win-win situation for both sides. (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998)

Staff Development and Cross Cultural Coordinator.

The faculty member who was selected by the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs to be the Staff Development and Cross Cultural Coordinator started as an adjunct faculty member at the College in 1990, before becoming a full-time faculty member in 1993.

The Coordinator had strong feelings about the importance of establishing a professional development program that served both faculty and classified staff. She said, "I think in terms of what people might want to learn. One of the things we really focused on was to try to have everyone working together" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998). She objected to compartmentalizing professional development according to whether an activity was for faculty or staff.

The first year of her appointment, the Coordinator used "learning the staff development components and getting to know people and different committees" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998). She also attended a National Council of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) conference. She was excited about what she had learned there, but back on campus she felt that the "attitude of people," among faculty in particular, limited the professional development possibilities.

The Coordinator was pointed in her comments about a power struggle between herself and the Professional Development Council a.k.a. Staff Development Advisory Committee:

> People thought I had a budget and a checkbook. So . . . that was clarified [when she told them] "No, I don't have a checkbook. No, I don't have a budget. Everything we want to do, I have to get okayed though the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs." (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998)

Though the College had no official budget line for professional development, the Coordinator discovered that "Whatever we needed for staff development was already budgeted in a way through the College." She also discovered that "the funding was different for faculty and CSO [Classified Staff Organization]" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998).

After the first year the Coordinator and the Professional Development Council members had a long talk. "We felt that as a council we should have some . . . money for the whole year to work within" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998). In her year-end report, she requested $3000 for the year. "Nobody really used it except for our final meetings which ultimately were to come into the council to form a group . . . . [that] even the council itself did not attend. So I found that to be very frustrating" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998).

The chairperson of the Professional Development Council also found the year to be frustrating. In part, he faulted the lack of clear rules as one source of frustration. He explained:

> Our rules were not as clearly defined as they should have been. I was the chair of the committee, and I forget exactly what her title was, anyway we had

> conflicts. For one year we worked together and things didn't gel very well. But we put together programs. We had a retreat and that sort of thing. Faculty participated, classified participated. The administration really never did . . . you just could not drag them into it. Then at the end of the year I resigned from the position. (personal communication, Sept. 9, 1998)

In the second year when the Coordinator became the chair of the Professional Development Council, she thought that the Council was beginning to develop as a team representing the three major employee constituency groups: administrative, faculty, and classified staff. "People began to share [information about] workshops that were coming up" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998).

She counted as a success the establishment of a staff development day during the semester when class would be canceled and the entire College engaged in professional development activities:

> I come from a background of days that are built into the academic calendar that are staff development days. Other states refer to them as flex days. This is an idea that I had success with the Council. Now, no one ever said, "Oh yes, this is the idea that was brought out." Apparently they had been talking about it. So that's how, I'm assuming, that the staff development day idea came to be. (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998)

The Coordinator believed that having one or two days for professional development during the school year allowed the days to be more focused than holding professional development for five days before classes started. Discussing the five-day professional development format previously used by the College, she said, "There were fun things to do and things that the departments would put on. I enjoyed it, but because I'm from the other structured background, I tend to like a day or two instead of five" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998).

She and the committee developed a five-year plan of workshops. After three years she said she knew "some things were getting ready to change" (personal communication, Apr. 27, 1998). She decided to leave the coordinator's position.

When the new Vice President for Instruction took office, things did change. The Assistant to the President For Minority Affairs turned professional development over to the new Vice President and the Vice President replaced the Professional Development Council and the position of coordinator with a three-member professional development team.

Vice President for Instruction.

The Vice President for Instruction began her career at the College in 1967 as faculty member teaching chemistry. She was department chairperson for thirteen years. She started the Science and Technology Resource Center (STRC) and became its "self-announced director." In January 1993 she was named Dean of the Sciences, Mathematics, and Health Technology Division. When the previous Vice President for Instruction chose to return to the classroom, the College conducted a nationwide search to fill the position. The Dean of Science, Mathematics and Health Technology applied and in 1997 she was selected from a national pool of applicants.

The Vice President for Instruction had some very strong feelings about faculty professional development, in part because of her own experience as a faculty member:

> When I was a young faculty here, I . . . viewed professional development purely in the sense of my discipline. And to me that was the most important thing and the conferences I attended . . . . But slowly, I also started attending . . . educational conferences . . . . So I basically, firmly, strongly believe in the need for professional development. But I think it needs to be diversified, because I think the faculty draws strength through its diversity. And . . . I don't mean gender and race diversity, I mean interest diversity.
>
> I feel very strongly that people who like their discipline, who are interested mostly in their discipline, and would like to do some research in it ought to be supported. I have people who are interested in developing different teaching methodology, [they] ought to be allowed and supported to do that . . . . People who like to do something else, ought to be supported in that. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

When she was a faculty member she said that she knew little about how the College functioned. She did not know whether or not the College supported faculty professional development, and whether it did or did not made no difference to her:

> I wasn't really ever thinking that I didn't have enough. I never had that feeling. I used to go to conferences with whatever funds we had. And then when funds weren't sufficient, I made do . . . . Also this [metropolitan] area is

> tremendously wealthy in terms of professional development and opportunity. So I believe anybody who does not partake of the opportunity is just, I think it's a crime. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She was not aware of any formal professional development program at the College:

> I may be wrong, but I do not believe that there ever was a thrust in that direction, [a] strong thrust in that direction. There were workshops, there were some seminars, but . . . until very recently, more haphazard. In other words, a division or a department would organize something. Or an area would organize something. The only planned concerted effort toward professional development was in terms of these professional development days that we have at the beginning of the semester. That was the only thing that I recall ever having as a planned [and] organized. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She wasn't satisfied with how faculty professional development had been handled at the division level, so she changed it:

> When I became a dean, I turned our divisional meeting times into professional development meetings. We used it in different ways. Several times I invited people to come and talk to the division and then followed that with some workshops. Once I think I had divisional people . . . show different technologies and have a showcase . . . . So I felt very strongly that there was a need for that. It made some impact, I don't know how strong of course, it was

> never measured. But I think in two different ways. One was through those workshops, but the other was in the combined [faculty evaluation] conferences . . . . At every single one of those conferences, I . . . was encouraging . . . and attempting to push them in the direction of professional development. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

While she hoped her faculty felt more professional because she was giving them professional activities, she wasn't certain, "That is something they have to tell you. I truly would not be able to say an unequivocal yes or no" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

Until she became Vice President for Instruction, she was not aware that faculty professional development was not in the Office of Instruction. "When I found that out, I was very fortunate that [the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs] actually was very happy to relinquish it. And I was thrilled to take it on" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

As happy as she was to be in charge of faculty professional development, she admitted, "I started in the same haphazard way. In other words, not really knowing exactly quite the direction" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998). However, she quickly found her way. "I put together the Professional Development Team, and I think that was the best thing that I've done. I think that committee really did a superb job of giving us a direction and coming up with some ideas" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

One of her charges to the Professional Development Team was to create a professional development program for faculty. The Professional Development Team conducted a survey to assess faculty's professional development needs and interests. The memo that accompanied the survey reflected the Vice President's commitment to faculty professional development:

> Last fall I proposed the creation of a new, comprehensive professional development plan designed specifically to meet the needs and interests of our faculty. I'm pleased to tell you that progress toward the creation of this plan is being made. By completing and returning this survey by May 1, 1998 . . . you will know that your specific professional development needs and interests will be considered in the new professional development plan. (College Archives, Vice President for Instruction Memorandum to all faculty, Apr. 17, 1998)

In addition to appointing the Professional Development Committee, the Vice President also planned to establish a Teaching and Learning Center. "Beginning in the fall [of 1999] . . . I'm putting in place this Teaching/Learning Center which I now have the space[3] for too" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998). She planned to equip the Teaching and Learning Center with computers and other resources including a technology person and a faculty member. She envisioned the Center as

> an umbrella organization which will encompass all the professional development activities. [It will] really give a cohesion, a glue to all of these

---

[3] When she did not get the space she had anticipated, she established a "virtual" Teaching and Learning Center.

> various activities that happen on campus. So there's Reasoning across Curriculum, Writing Across Curriculum, Communicating Across Curriculum, Professional Development Team, technology workshops, the Pedagogy Subcommittee, and these workshops will now have a home.
>
> I'm also putting together an Advisory Board for that. And, I'm putting actually two bodies . . . an internal Advisory Board or internal Executive Committee, and an external one . . . . I want representation from the Collegewide community, so that there is a body of people that gives advice and is also an advocate for the Center to interact and provide the buy-in of the College community. And for external . . . [I] firmly believe in collaboration and working with other colleges. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She also wanted members of the business community, the newspaper, and the health community on the "external" Advisory Board that would provide feedback on how the College was doing.

When prompted for her definition for faculty professional development, she said:

> I would define it as a continuous life-long growth professionally, I don't want to say [only] in discipline because it doesn't have to be. Professional expansion of horizons that results in understanding and comprehension of the intrinsic role of the faculty member, and just the enrichment, plain enrichment. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She knew that some people objected to her view that faculty members could be professionally developed by attending workshops in subjects outside of their disciplines. Nevertheless, she affirmed her position, "I think . . . it gives . . . a person a different dimension, and makes a stronger and richer person" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

She objected to including retirement workshops and wellness workshops as professional development activities, saying, "That I don't call professional development. I think it's important to have those. But, to me, that is not what I call professional development" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

She believed that professional development should be for all faculty.

> I really do believe it should be addressing the needs of faculty because I believe our business is educating students. And that is our goal, that's the goal of the institution . . . . So, if indeed, we are viewing professional development as ultimately impacting students, then it out to be directed at faculty. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She thought that technology was an important part of faculty professional development, because, she reasoned:

> There are more and more courses that we should develop to offer online. And, while that definitely is not an answer for everybody's needs, it is an answer to some people's needs. In order to do that, [faculty must] be technologically more savvy and competent . . . . I think a young kid in a class who is very strong in computer skills can become disillusioned and disappointed in the

> faculty that can't really understand what the [student] is talking about. I [also] believe there is a way to use the technology as a tool to become more effective in the classroom, not . . . as an end to itself, but . . . as a tool to assist with students and to make them stronger and better learners. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She recognized that "so far, most of the [professional development] efforts have been really unfortunately, more or less, top-down, and I don't mean imposed. But the ideas . . . came from this office" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998). Her ideal is for the faculty to take the initiative in saying, "We would like to have [for example] some scholar[ly] theme . . . or we would like to have some more pedagogy. We need to find experts and we would like to go into this" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

She envisioned a structure in which the faculty would go to the Teaching and Learning Center, and the Center would support the faculty's interests. She anticipated the development of a synergy in which her office would be responding to the interests and needs identified by faculty.

She was aware that the College had never had a faculty professional development budget line and offered three reasons:

1. We are very cash poor, very, very, very cash poor. Our budget is incredibly thin.
2. It was never viewed as sufficiently important to actually put a dollar figure next to it.

> 3. There was not enough push for it. Quite frankly, I think if the faculty came on a little stronger and said, "We need to have this. We want it," I think perhaps some of that would have happened. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

She knew that money used for professional development was scattered throughout the budget, but that no one was willing to give up his or her share. She came to understand that the only way to realize her vision of faculty professional development was to institutionalize it, but she did not believe that would be possible until the College had a new president. She said, "Not only would it take a new president, but [also] it would take a president who would be very committed to [professional development]" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998). She knew that if the new president was willing to institutionalize faculty professional development by creating a budget line for it, some people would be unhappy, because, as she explained, "He or she is going to pull this money from different areas . . . . Some things cannot happen without making some people unhappy. It's an essential reality" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

She believed she had taken the first step toward institutionalizing faculty professional development by establishing the Teaching and Learning Center. By putting two people in it she had created a de facto budget which consisted of their salaries. She also included money earmarked for faculty grants into the expense of running the Teaching and Learning Center. Still, she realized that until an actual budget line was established, the existence of the Teaching and Learning Center was tenuous, and probably would not last any longer than her time in office. She knew that having a budget line for the Teaching and Learning Center did not guarantee its permanence, however the budget line would create a financial history independent of the administrator in charge. The Vice President for Instruction planned to establish a Teaching and Learning Center budget line within the next two years. Then the existence of the Teaching and Learning Center would be, in her words, "unequivocal" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

She saw some professional development support coming out of the Title III grant which she expected the College to receive. The grant would provide funding for two specialists:

> [One] with strong technical skills, computer skills, combined with creative ideas who would be the person not to just help faculty, but actually . . . to assist faculty in thinking about new ideas and bringing new ideas into their classes . . . . The other person is basically for technical support to go from office to office to help faculty. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

In her opinion, faculty professional development in departments should focus on each department's discipline. Again, she explained her vision, "I would like to see . . . [the] department come up with an idea. [Someone] comes to the Teaching and Learning Center and says, 'We would love to have these workshops' . . . . [Then the] Teaching and Learning Center helps them do it" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998). She emphasized that "nobody else, nor I, could ever think of what it is that the department needs because that's where they're focused and specifically paying attention to their discipline" (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998).

In discussing the issue of faculty who are not interested in professional development, she said:

> Well, like any place, I think this place has that problem . . . with some of the older faculty. No, I shouldn't say older, but some faculty. I think you have that everywhere. In any place of work you have some people who are highly enthusiastic and energized . . . . Then you have those who just come in, do their work, leave and that's the end of that. And those people I don't think you can ever turn around if there is no self-motivation and self-desire to grow. (personal communication, Dec. 18, 1998)

This Vice President for Instruction's interest in faculty professional development is of long standing, and she has achieved a position in which she can exercise her ideas of what it should be. She wants faculty to match her enthusiasm and interest in professional development and seems disappointed when they don't.

Summary: Administrators' and Administrative Staff Members' Perspectives

Of the five administrators who have had responsibility for faculty professional development, no two of them agreed on how it be handled, and each of them administered it according to his or her point of view. Their methods of administering professional development varied from hands-off to hands-on. In some cases, the administrators had diametrically opposite points of view. They differed on whether or not professional development should be required; whether it should consist of group activities or individual pursuits; and whether it should be conducted at the beginning of the semester or within the semester. As a result, the professional development program was uneven and fragmented to a point that when the current Vice President for Instruction was a faculty member, she did not realize that the College had a professional development program.

Under the responsibility of the top level College administrators, professional development did not materialize as a strategic priority during the 1990s even though it was included as such in the 1989-94 Master Plan (p. 16). The first Vice President for Instruction was not interested in planning professional development programs. During the time professional development programming was in his office, he left it up to his administrative assistants. When the responsibility for professional development moved to the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs, she saw it as an add-on to the Cross-Cultural program. She hired a faculty member to coordinate both the professional development program and the Cross-Cultural program. The Coordinator, in a somewhat antagonistic relationship with the Staff Development Advisory Committee, subsumed faculty professional development into staff professional development. The Coordinator held an all-College professional development day during the semester with programs intended to meet the professional development needs of all College employees.

Of the five administrators who have handled faculty professional development since 1973, the current Vice President for Instruction has been the only visionary, the most involved, and the most willing to build permanent support for faculty professional development by creating a budget line for the Teaching and Learning Center. Perhaps this is because she is the only administrator who truly wanted and willingly accepted responsibility for faculty professional development. She has taken steps to establish continuity in professional development, but she questions how long what she has put in place will last after she leaves.

Faculty's Perspectives

Just as administrators have different points of view about how professional development should be handled, so do faculty members. Faculty have expressed their professional development needs and interests in College surveys with the expectation that the College would tailor programs to meet them. However, a faculty member does not have to depend on the College to provide professional development activities: some faculty members have created their own professional development programs. This section explores the faculty's approach to professional development as expressed by the actions of individual faculty, and by faculty responses to surveys and focus groups.

Earning a Doctorate

Many faculty members have pursued their own personal professional development independently of the College. The most common individual professional development activity is undertaking more graduate courses and earning another degree, usually a doctorate.

Obtaining a doctorate while employed at the College appears to be an individual professional development activity that dates back to the earliest days of the College. The College's first Dean of Academic Affairs was also the first person to obtain his doctorate while working for the College. He was hired as a part-time faculty member in 1958, the year the College opened. He had earned his doctorate by 1963.

Over the years, many faculty members have followed suit. A review of the credentials of faculty members and administrators listed in the College catalogs showed that of the 80 administrators and faculty members listed in both the College Catalog 1998-2000 (College Archives, pp. 125-133) and the College Catalog 1974-75 (College Archives, pp. 170-180), only 14 had doctorates in 1974. Between 1974 and 1998, 26 of the remaining 66 had earned additional degrees. Twenty-four earned doctorates, one earned a master's degree, and another earned a CPA. Eleven of the 26 obtained their additional degrees before the College implemented the tuition reimbursement policy in 1981 (College Archives, College Catalog 1980-81, pp. 107.114).

Faculty members are still interested in obtaining their doctorates. In the 1998 Survey Results, faculty were asked to " tell us what you hope to accomplish in your own professional growth over the next five years." Of the 112 full-time and 56 part-time faculty who responded to the question, 20 (18%) were interested in starting or completing doctoral study.

Faculty could offer many reasons for why they want to pursue their doctorates. One reason is that the doctorate is the "currency of higher education," which translates into more money and possible promotion.

The link between degrees and salary–the higher the degree, the higher the salary–has existed since the inception of the College. From 1958 until 1970 faculty salaries were "paid according to the same formula as the county public school teachers," which was "based on academic preparation [i.e. degree] and the number of years of teaching experience" (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum, Oct. 28, 1969).

In 1970, College faculty salaries were disassociated from county school teachers' salaries. Academic rank and academic degree became linked to salary (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Chairman Memorandum, Feb. 10, 1970). College faculty benefit from earning additional degrees because academic rank was, and still is, determined in part by the level of education of the faculty member. If a faculty member wants to be promoted to full professor, he or she is required to earn 30 additional credits beyond a master's degree (College Archives, Faculty Professional Growth and Development Plan, 1993, p. 45).

Taking graduate courses has long been an encouraged professional development activity. In academic year (AY) 1969, when the Rank and Tenure Committee submitted "Basic Criteria for Tenure and Advancement in Rank" to the

Faculty Senate for approval, the Committee specifically identified "advanced graduate study" as a professional development activity. In 1972 the Rank, Salary and Tenure Committee proposed strengthening the criteria for promotion by placing "one, . . . more emphasis on the on the value of college teaching experience and two, [by placing] more emphasis on the acquisition of graduate work" (College Archives, Proposed Faculty Welfare Package, Feb. 22, 1972, p. 6).

Since 1974, the Faculty Evaluation Plan has included advanced graduate study as a professional development activity. The Faculty Evaluation Plan has been modified and changed over the years,[4] however, professional development such as additional course work continues to be an element in each plan.

Creating Programs

Some faculty members have taken charge of their own professional development in ways that directly benefited the College community. Two stellar examples are the faculty member who established Writing Across the Curriculum and Reasoning Across the Curriculum, and the faculty member who made the campus aware of women's studies. Each faculty member is discussed in turn.

Faculty member who established Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Reasoning Across the Curriculum (RAC).

---

[4] 1974: First Faculty Evaluation Plan with professional development requirement; 1978: Board of Trustees modified plan; 1982: President modified plan; 1996: New Faculty Evaluation Plan.

This veteran writing teacher single-handedly created his own long term professional development programs by founding WAC, and RAC. His programs benefit faculty and students. WAC offers workshops and programs to encourage faculty members to have students do more writing. RAC teaches faculty to write assignments and test questions that generate critical thinking.

When the writing teacher founded WAC in 1989, he was already a tenured, full professor who had been a member of the College faculty since 1966. This College veteran was not motivated by the need for promotion, or rank. He founded WAC because, in his words, "I thought it was a good idea. If I didn't do it, it wouldn't get done. So I wanted to do it" (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997).

As a faculty member, he had no authority and no money to establish WAC. To get the release time necessary to develop the program, he needed the Faculty Senate to recommend the establishment of WAC to the Dean of Academic Affairs. He presented his proposal to the Professional Development Sub-Committee of the Faculty Senate. He explained, "I knew I needed their endorsement for the [Faculty] Senate to tell [the Dean of Academic Affairs], 'Yes, this is a good idea'" (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997). He received the Faculty Senate's endorsement and the Dean granted him release time. Even though he established WAC on the College campus he never directed it: "At the same time I started WAC, I became chair of the writing department and I . . . couldn't get release time to do both . . . . So . . . the first thing I did as chair [was to] persuade [another faculty member] to be the first director" (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997).

Fifteen years later, in 1994, he started Reasoning Across the Curriculum (RAC). In addition to believing that RAC was a good idea, he had some personal motives for starting the program: he was interested in the subject, he needed relief from being department chairman, and he needed a respite from full time teaching. As he explained:

> After 10 or 11 years as the department chair, I got tired of it. I didn't want to do it any more for a variety of reasons. And so I [thought,] what should I do? I said, "Well this [RAC] is a good idea." I don't want to do nothing but teach. I just want to do more than just that one thing. (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997).

His reasons for wanting to start RAC are consistent with his explanation for why faculty need professional development activities:

> to keep us from being burnt out because of our discouragement . . . . You know, we try to do a good job teaching, and we just get discouraged at a variety of things. And these workshops keep us motivated. Give us new strategies, approaches, things to try. AC [Across the Curriculum] programs is [sic] what has kept me going for all these years. It's just something different to do. You get discouraged because what you try to do well doesn't seem to be working. You know, students don't do it. And so there must be some other way. Professional development workshops provide that other way. (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997)

As with WAC, he needed administrative approval to get release time to establish RAC. This time he presented his plan for RAC directly to the Vice President for Instruction, who turned him down. Undaunted, the veteran faculty member surveyed the faculty. "I took a survey of all of the faculty to convince him [Vice President for Instruction] that it really had grassroots appeal. Ninety-three percent of the people said they would go to [RAC] workshops" (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997). When the Vice President for Instruction saw the survey results, he approved the plan and budgeted six hours release time. According to the faculty member, 100 people attended the first workshop.

The Across the Curriculum (AC) programs have become part of the institution. A third program, Communications Across the Curriculum (CAC), has been added. Each AC program has a director. The directors of the AC programs receive release time semester by semester. Realizing that the administration controls release time, the RAC director worries that some semester the administrators may not think the AC programs are worthwhile. He voiced his concern:

> In actuality the cost to the institution, a good three hours of release time [per semester] is the cost of a part-time replacement. If what you do is worth $1500 then whoever is in charge can continue it. And, you know, that's what I face, or feel that I face, I don't know. Figure that at any moment somebody might say, "Reasoning Across the Curriculum isn't really worth $3000. Why are we doing it?" (personal communication, Oct. 9, 1997).

His concern seems unwarranted, at least in the near future, because the three Across the Curriculum programs have been included as part of the Pedagogy Committee, which was established in 1998 by the director of the Teaching and Learning Center with the approval of the Vice President for Instruction. The programs that the faculty member began in response to his own personal professional development need have been embraced as Collegewide professional development activities.

Faculty member who introduced women's studies to the campus.

In the mid-1980s, Maryland colleges became interested in a project "to integrate new scholarship on women into survey courses in various disciplines" (College Archives, Coordinator Memorandum to all faculty and administrators, Sept. 26, 1986). The College was one of 10 colleges invited to participate in the project directed by Towson State University and funded by the United States Department of Education (College Archives, Coordinator Memorandum to all faculty and administrators, Sept. 26, 1986).

The invitation struck a particularly positive note with a College activist and former president of the Faculty Senate who had begun to promote integrating the scholarship on women into courses. She was anxious for the College to accept Towson's invitation to participate, but the College administration offered little support. In her newsletter directed to the "Women's Scholarship Committee and Others" she reported:

> A memo from . . . [the] Dean of Instruction informed us that the Deans' Council had not approved the released time commitment to enable us to participate in the Towson Grant. However, he held out the possibility of some support for our effort to integrate scholarship on women into the curriculum. (College Archives, Newsletter Integrating the Scholarship on Women, Jan. 19, 1988, p. 1).

After meeting with some of the administrative assistants, she reported, "They promised three hours released time from Instruction and a small budget from Affirmative Action to cover honoraria and refreshments for the planned colloquia for the Spring" (College Archives, Newsletter Integrating the Scholarship on Women, Jan. 19, 1988, p. 1).

In spite of limited initial support from the administration, this advocate of women's studies persevered. She enthusiastically recruited faculty to participate in the Towson University FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) grant, and she obtained support from the College president: "[President #6] has pledged released time for five faculty members and a campus coordinator for the length of the project, Spring 1989 through Spring 1990" (Newsletter Integrating the Scholarship on Women, March 15, 1988, p. 1).

In a 1998 interview with the activist, she fondly recalled, "We had the consortium, a FIPSE thing, with the women's study with Towson. When it was sort of a big cooperative venture, well-funded, then it was successful" (personal communication, April 15). The determined faculty member succeeded in integrating women's studies into the College curriculum. A course entitled Women in Literature (EGL 250)[5] has been offered at the College since 1990.

Even though this accomplished faculty member's professional development activities have been successful, she recalled with some frustration the College's lack of support for her personal professional development opportunity when she received a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) grant to study at Columbia University, New York. "I mean, I lost a year to everything. I was just on executive leave. They [the College] kept my job. I had tenure already. So that was it. In other words, I didn't get a lot of encouragement" (personal communication, April 15, 1998).

Nevertheless, she continued to pursue her interests. In addition to promoting women's studies, she initiated a faculty organization called ETC (for "Expanding the Curriculum") (College Archives, ETC newsletter, Sept. 24, 1990). The purpose of the group, she explained, was "to find ways of expanding the curriculum here at the College. To take account of race, gender, and class in structuring courses, citing examples in lectures and discussions, and generally improving the 'climate' in our classrooms" (College Archives, ETC newsletter, Sept. 24, 1990).

---

[5] College Catalog 1990-91, p. 95.

ETC went on to collaborate with the faculty committee on African-American scholarship to establish "a series of monthly brown-bag Reader's Groups" (College Archives, ETC newsletter, Jan. 1991).

The activist has continued her work in women's studies. In spring 2000, using a $2000 Trailblazer grant that she received from the College, she held a "Visible Women" conference. For this conference she brought together women artists, authors, and politicians to discuss their careers. The new College president (President #7) and his wife attended. As with the WAC and RAC programs initiated by the previously discussed faculty member, the College and the community have benefited from this faculty activist's professional development activities.

Surveys and Focus Groups

In 1967, 1971, 1987, 1995, and 1998 large-scale surveys were conducted at the College to determine the professional development wants/needs/interests of faculty members. No two surveys were alike: different groups sponsored and conducted each survey, the target recipients varied from survey to survey, the information requested varied from survey to survey, and the reported results from each surveys varied considerably–from full reports to simple summaries. The surveys represented the College's best effort to identify the faculty's professional development wants, needs, and interests.

1967 Survey.

In October 1967, the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate reported the results of a faculty survey. Faculty members were asked to indicate which of a number of items "needed attention." The results, reported in Table 4, are listed as the percentage of the 67 faculty who replied.

Table 4
1967 Survey Categories that "Needed Attention" According to Faculty: 67 responses rank ordered by percent of faculty selecting category

Faculty pay	70%	Insurance	34%
Tenure for faculty	70%	Divisional chairmen method of choice	34%
Academic load	67%	Improvements on campus	33%
Academic rank	51%	Membership on committees, faculty/ administrative balance	33%
Academic freedom	48%	Supplies purchase and distribution	33%
Sabbatical leave policy	43%	Budget policy declared in writing	31%
Administrative policy presented to faculty in writing	41%	Budget policy: faculty/administration in making and implementing	29%
Tuition reimbursement	40%	Clubs–types to be allowed	22%
Faculty Evaluation	40%		

Fewer than half of the respondents thought that either of the professional development items– sabbatical leave policy (48%) and tuition reimbursement (40%) "needed attention" (College Archives, Executive Council of Faculty Senate minutes, Oct. 17, 1967).

Conclusions are difficult to draw from the results, and the Council did not try. The survey does indicate that about half of the respondents had some knowledge of the sabbatical leave policy and tuition reimbursement that made them think the two items "needed attention."

1971 Survey.

The Faculty Development Committee surveyed new faculty to find out their reaction to their first semester of teaching at the College:

> The Faculty Development Committee, charged with the responsibility for providing opportunities for teachers to examine and improve their roles in the continually fluctuating educational process, has turned to the new faculty . . . in an attempt to acquire a "fresh" perspective on the relationship of the faculty to the College community. (College Archives, Faculty Development Committee, 1971, p. 1)

New faculty members were asked to comment on five basic areas: student attitudes, curriculum, institutional facilities, administration, and colleagues. The survey enjoyed a 71% return with 24 of 34 new faculty responding. The general conclusions drawn from the responses of first semester faculty were

1. good overall instructional environment
2. more communication needed between students and teachers
3. vague curriculum objectives
4. innovation is not the solution to student/teacher apathy

5. teachers "too often concern themselves with 'appearances not essential issues'"
6. "a teacher, like a child, undergoes the 'formative years,' and each experience he encounters must be weighed carefully in the development of his personal education philosophy." (College Archives, Faculty Development Committee, 1971, p. 3)

None of the respondents made any comments about faculty professional development, although several of their comments had professional development implications. The Professional Development Committee used the survey results as the basis for a "discussion/dialogue colloquium" to which all faculty were "encouraged to attend and participate in this continuing attempt to gain perspective" (College Archives, Faculty Development Committee, 1971, p. 1).

1987 Survey.

In 1987 the Professional Development Committee, a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, "instigated the survey" (College Archives, Ryan, Acknowledgments). A faculty member, in conjunction with the College's Institutional Research Office, developed the survey, ran the survey, analyzed the results, and wrote the final report. In a 1999 interview, the faculty member explained why the Committee "instigated" the survey:

> We always were concerned in the Committee about participation in activities.

> The fact that there seemed to be lots of good activities being offered on campus and yet, there was a substantial group of people that weren't participating for one reason or another. So we just had the feeling that we needed to know more about what people wanted and needed. We decided to find out. (personal communication, March 16, 1999)

This researcher had written a similar explanation eleven years earlier when she reported the results of the survey:

> This study was conducted at the request of the Faculty Professional Development Committee of [the College] to establish a body of information which could be used by the College in determining how best to meet the professional development needs of its faculty in the coming years. The Committee itself intends to use the results as a basis for planning future professional development activities, and also for making general recommendations about the use of whatever funds may be available for faculty development. (College Archives, Ryan, 1987, p. 1)

The researcher said that the survey was a modified version of an audit produced by the Task Force on Professional Growth of the American Association for Higher Education in 1987. The survey attempted "to address all aspects of a faculty member's role, with the intention of considering a wide range of possible activities which might serve to enrich a faculty member's professional life and contribute to his or her professional growth," (Ryan, 1987, August, p. 1).

One outcome of the survey was a rank ordered list of professional activities that respondents said they did most frequently:

1. taught traditional daytime credit courses on the main campus
2. kept up with subject area literature
3. attended professional society meetings and activities
4. attended professional development workshops or seminars on effective teaching methods
5. developed and [taught] new courses
6. used nontraditional teaching techniques. (College Archives, Ryan, 1987, Executive Summary, unnumbered page).

The researcher commented on the faculty members' choices, "These activities . . . form the core of most faculty members' professional roles, since respondents to the . . . survey also rated them as both important to the college and desirable to participate in" (College Archives, Ryan, 1987, Executive Summary, unnumbered page).

Results of the Faculty Professional Development Committee survey yielded the following conclusions:

> Institutional support appears insufficient. This suggests that many faculty members who engage in professional activities beyond the basic faculty role do so for reasons other than any encouragement, recognition, or rewards accorded them for such activities by the college.

The greatest unfulfilled desires were for involvement in interdisciplinary teaching, honors courses, team teaching, and commercial publication of curriculum materials.

The factor most frequently cited by faculty members as limiting their professional activities was lack of time.

Faculty members are most interested in participating in professional development functions relating to subject area knowledge and growth.

Faculty members are much more likely to attend activities held on campus than elsewhere and most are willing to come to those scheduled during the week before fall classes begin–a time which has traditionally been used for faculty meetings and workshops.

In the case of [College] sponsored activities, it appears to make little difference whether the presenters are from on-campus or off.

Participatory workshops are the second choice of format for professional development activities and class day afternoons are the second most acceptable time to schedule such activities. (College Archives, Ryan, 1987, Executive Summary, unnumbered page).

In summarizing the results of the study, Ryan reported:

The professional roles of most full-time faculty members at [the College] center around teaching, and also maintaining or expanding their teaching skills and subject area knowledge. One important way for faculty members to maintain their professional credentials is through participation in professional

> society activities relating to their respective subject areas. Since time and funding limitations curtail faculty members' attendance at such functions, especially those held at distant locations, on-campus professional development activities can also be important. These are readily accessible to many more individuals, particularly when scheduled during the week before fall classes or on class day afternoons . . . .
>
> As a group, [the College] faculty members are already involved in a wide range of professional pursuits, including both alternative teaching activities and other types of professional involvement. Nevertheless, many respondents expressed frustration at the limited time available to them for professional development, and at the paucity of institutional support–both tangible and intangible–for such activities.
>
> The overall perception seems to be that the college places little value on the professional activities and achievements of its faculty members. (College Archives, Ryan, 1987, p. 37).

The results of this survey provided impetus for President #6 to establish an annual Honors Convocation for faculty and staff (personal communication, Nov. 2, 1998). The first annual Honors Convocation was held in fall 1988. An individual from each of the three employee constituency groups–administrative staff, classified staff, and faculty organization–was selected to receive the most prestigious award their constituency group offered. The climax of the Convocation is the awarding of the President's Medal. The College describes the President's Medal as "the highest honor bestowed on a member of our own college community. The award recognizes sustained, high-quality contributions and dedicated service in support of the college's mission to respond to the educational needs of [the county's] citizens" (College Archives, Honors Convocation Program, 1989).

Other than establishing the Honors Convocation, the administration did nothing else in response to the results of the survey.

1995 Survey.

The assignment of the Coordinator of Staff Development and Cross Cultural Education was to develop, coordinate and implement a comprehensive program of staff development and cross cultural education for all College employees (College Archives, Position Description, June 2, 1994). In spring 1995 she conducted a survey to obtain information that she thought would help her accomplish her assignment.

The survey was distributed to both the faculty and classified staff. The Coordinator's report does not indicate the number of surveys that were distributed, but she does report that 172 were returned. She presented a summary of the "collegewide survey" as an addendum to her Report on Staff Development: Present and Future. The summary is a set of five lists with little or no analysis:

1. A list of 29 "individual staff development activities" reported by respondents.
2. A list of 11 "staff development departmentally" -offered activities.

> 3. A list of 49 names of "staff development resource personnel" and the topics they were willing to present in a workshop, seminar, round-table discussion, and/or training session on campus.
> 4. A list of 22 "other suggested topics."
> 5. A list of 33 different workshop topics which respondents selected as the ones they would be interested in attending. (College Archives, Report on Staff Development, 1995, unnumbered page)

The respondents were most likely attend a workshop on "using the Internet," which received 69 "votes," more than twice as many as the other most commonly selected topics: desktop publishing (31 votes), personal health and fitness (30 votes), using e-mail (34 votes), and humor in the workplace (34 votes) (College Archives, Report on Staff Development, 1995, unnumbered page).

The Coordinator reported that while "staff development activity at [the College] is profoundly abundant," it was "territorial" because "these staff development activities have been exclusive of each other or simply offered for each constituency group exclusively, there has not been a trend toward collegewide activities" (College Archives, Report on Staff Development, 1995, p. 2).

The Coordinator of Staff Development and Cross-Cultural Education used the results of the survey to demonstrate that:

> most employees at [the College] share the same needs and wants . . . . For example, the surveys indicated an across the college desire for workshops on Internet . . . . Another example of the desire for staff development activities is

> the fact that 48 college employees, from all constituency groups[,] offered to present workshops and/or seminars in their various areas of expertise. (College Archives, Report on Staff Development, 1995, pp. 2-3).

The Coordinator further reported that "There are enough people willing to present workshops to create a staff development [program] for the next three years, and with an open invitation for others to follow suit, the calendar can continue past the year 2000" (College Archives, Report on Staff Development, 1995, p.3).

This survey was used by the Coordinator to obtain workshop presenters and to promote the importance of joint faculty/staff programs.

1998 Paper and Pencil Survey.

The spring 1998 survey was one of the first major undertakings of the three-member Professional Development Team that had been appointed in fall 1997 by the new Vice President for Instruction. Charged with providing a faculty professional development program, the team concluded that it needed to do some research to identify the professional development needs and interests of the faculty. The team decided on two research methods. One was a discrete paper and pencil survey of all faculty, which pinpointed specific faculty professional development needs and interests. The other was a series of focus groups, which provided a free-flowing discussion about professional development. The results of the focus groups will be discussed separately.

The faculty survey was designed and conducted in cooperation with the

College's Office of Institutional Research and Analysis (OIRA). The answer sheet for the 4-page, 120-item survey was read electronically. Of the 1128 surveys sent to three faculty groups–full-time, adjunct, and continuing education–350 (31%) were completed and returned. The returned surveys were disaggregated into the three faculty groups and weighted so that the responses would proportionately represent the composition of the faculty.

A final report on the survey was never written; however, an extensive disaggregated numerical analysis of the survey provided insight into faculty members' interest in their own professional development. For example, when survey respondents were asked to select 3 professional development areas from a list of 22 which they planned to emphasize in the next two years, there were five top picks by percent of faculty selecting. These are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Top Five Professional Development Areas Faculty Planned to Emphasize in the Two Years Following the 1998 Paper and Pencil Survey

Professional Development Area	Full-Time	Part-Time	Continuing Education
More knowledge in field	43%	44%	37%
Staying current in field	43%	40%	38%
Enhance teaching skills	37%	32%	38%
More PC skills	18%	18%	36%
Advancing new educational method/ technology	22%	8%	28%

Note: Source is Administrators' Files, Survey Results, 1998, item L, p. 3.

The responses to this question indicate that individual faculty members are willing to undertake their own professional development. They want to stay current, learn more in their own disciplines, and be better teachers. Advancing computer skills was a distant fourth choice, and of more interest to continuing education faculty than to either full- or part-time faculty.

Faculty were asked to rate 13 different items according to how important each would be in promoting professional development for the entire faculty, on a scale of 1 (not important) to 4 (very important). The items that received the highest mean average are listed in Table 6.

Table 6
Mean Average of Items in Promoting Professional Development for the Entire Faculty in Response to the 1998 Paper and Pencil Survey

Item	Full-Time	Part-Time	Continuing Education
More salary/benefits	3.62	3.51	3.53
More teaching resources	3.54	3.34	3.39
Computer/technical training	3.54	3.34	3.06
Better campus facilities	3.40	3.23	3.24
Graduate study tuition help	3.23	3.29	3.19
Intercollegial sharing	3.15	3.20	3.17
Professional travel subsidy	3.52	2.95	3.02
Professional development leave time	3.38	3.08	2.85
Personal research grants	3.13	3.07	3.00

Note: Source is Administrators' Files, Survey Results, 1998, item O, p. 4.

The responses of the three faculty groups to this question are very similar: all three considered more salary/benefits as most important, followed by more teaching resources, and computer/technical training for promoting professional development for the entire faculty. The importance given salary/benefits implies that all faculty want to be paid more to participate in professional development. The teaching resources were unspecified, so what the respondents had in mind is unknown. Finally, each group thought computer/technical training was important for the entire college, even though as individuals acquiring more computer skills was fourth in terms of the activities each group planned to emphasize for themselves.

The results of the 1998 Paper and Pencil survey reinforced the results from the focus groups. A discussion of the focus group results follows.

1998 Focus Groups.

The Professional Development Team worked with a faculty member, who is a professional facilitator, to design the focus group research. The facilitator conducted a total of nine focus groups composed of five different categories of college personnel: two focus groups each were conducted with department chairs, senior faculty (employed over 5 years at the college), new faculty (employed 5 years or less at the college), and adjunct faculty. One focus group was conducted with the deans.

Each focus group was asked to decide how they would spend a hypothetical $500,000 on faculty professional development. The results of the focus groups were reported as a summary divided into three parts:

1. Key topics that were prominent in all nine focus groups included:

- Technology: need for hardware, software, computer training geared to ability; AV training; technology support staff; time to take and practice new technologies; and a way to involve faculty resistant to computers
- Individual Training/Support: need money for graduate course tuition, conference travel, and special project research and development
- Gear college training to specific disciplines, as through department/ division level: need money to attend conferences as a group, tailoring workshops for areas/discipline, hold area conferences on campus, connect with other community college faculty in same discipline
- Collegiality: desire for a way to get to know old, new, and adjunct faculty
- Faculty Resource Center: need a place where faculty could get technical help, including one-on-one assistance with technology and developing materials to use in classes
- Adjunct/new faculty needs: pay them to attend training sessions; schedule multiple times to accommodate their schedules; improve timely communications, particularly to adjuncts, so they receive adequate notice to attend activities; familiarize them with available services for students
- Pedagogy training: need to know: how to address levels of preparedness of students, how to address students with special needs,

how to apply technology to teaching strategies, classroom management skills, how to teach critical thinking, educational methods

- Workshop scheduling and format: offer workshops at different times to accommodate different schedules; offer a series or track for various topics, such as classroom issues and technology training

2. Innovative suggestions to support faculty:
    - have faculty who attend conferences make audio tapes of the highlights of the conference; have the tapes available for checking out in the department office so adjuncts and others can get updated.
    - team teaching: pair experienced faculty with inexperienced faculty
    - provide workshops online, chat room for faculty, videotapes in library for faculty to get training whenever they are free to do so
    - give one person in a department release time to support faculty learning to use technology
    - give one person in a department release time to identify and share library resources and web sites in the field
3. Key issues by focus group:
    - Deans: College needs improved technology; faculty needs educational training to meet "our students' needs as well as technology training"; "concern that faculty use release time to develop new ways to address our students"; "consensus that training should be targeted to specific classroom needs of faculty. . . . [t]hey did not see value in faculty and

staff training together, or a dedicated day for professional development."

- Chairs: need funds for software and hardware to update all faculty offices, resource people to assist faculty as they learn technologies; important to include adjuncts in training, including the idea of an adjunct faculty institute to provide on-going training for newer adjuncts; experienced and newer faculty need to learn from each other about techniques that work in the classroom; essential to have money to send people to expensive, specialized training; everyone needs more travel money; "Few supported one-day professional development," preferred on-going training noting that faculty who do contract training cannot cancel classes
- Senior Faculty: need retreats as opportunities to reconnect with faculty across campus and share ideas; desire for more interaction across departments on campus issues and intellectual topics; considered the value of visiting other campuses looking for new ideas; need for hardware and software and technical training; fear that money would be spent on technology equipment to the exclusion of other faculty support; mixed concern about one-day professional development; "some like everyone getting together, but some thought too much was pushed into one day"; run tracks of workshop topics throughout the year

- New Faculty: need for teacher training, including classroom style, objectives, innovative teaching methods, adapting to learning styles and knowing college policies; need computer workshops, should be offered at a variety of times; need time to meet other faculty members in other departments; liked having a professional development day, "but also wanted workshops on-going throughout the year"
- Adjunct Faculty: happy that their opinion was asked; need information about the college; faculty handbook explaining how "to get things done and college services" would help; need department information; "[t]hey described their difficulty in trying to find out what services exist and where they are located"; need computer workstations and printers to use; want workshops on classroom management issues; need to feel connected to faculty; hard to attend workshops when they are not paid to do so, "but some appreciated workshops they have attended." (College Archives, Focus Group Results Memorandum, Aug. 5, 1998)

It is clear that the survey and the focus groups produced similar results. The major general areas of agreement included:

- the need for more money to fund professional development opportunities
- the need for more computer hardware, software, training, and technology support services

- the need for more collegial opportunities (i.e. a way for faculty to spend time with each other).

The Professional Development Team used the results of the survey and focus groups as evidence to support existing programs and activities and to propose new activities. Events and activities that were supported by the studies included:

- continuing the small grants program initiated by the Vice President for Instruction and managed by the Professional Development Team
- having an all-college picnic at the beginning of fall semester
- providing faculty with more technology training
- developing an orientation and mentoring program for new faculty
- establishing an annual college-sponsored dinner/workshop for adjunct faculty. (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 2000, p. 55)

In response to the results of the survey and focus groups, the Vice President for Instruction established a technical resource room equipped with state-of-the-art computers and a technician to help faculty.

Summary: Faculty's Perspectives

Some faculty members are willing to take their own professional development into their own hands: they know what interests them and they know what they need. The College has sometimes had difficulty supporting individual's unique professional development goals. Even so, determined faculty have pressed on to satisfy their own personal development needs, which also have benefited the College.

The quality of the various surveys that have been conducted over the years at the College varies considerably. The 1987 and 1998 surveys were the most scientifically designed and conducted, and therefore should be the most reliable. The results of the 1998 survey and the results of the focus groups were mutually supportive.

Based on the results of the 1987 and 1998 surveys and focus groups, the faculty's perspective on professional development is reasonably consistent. Most faculty do want to improve in the knowledge of their discipline and their teaching skills. They realize that they should be technologically literate. They are willing to pursue their own professional development with or without the College's help, but would be more professionally active if they were paid to be. All faculty expressed a need to develop stronger collegial relationships with their colleagues.

Faculty Representatives

When the College first opened, faculty did not need representatives. The faculty was small and the first president had frequent meetings in which the entire faculty participated. The College grew rapidly and the required administrative work grew with it. To help with the administrative load the President formed the President's Advisory Council, which consisted of the President's senior staff officers. He then created four divisions, each of which headed by a division chairman (College Archives, Badger, 1986). The Dean of Academic Affairs met with the chairmen, who relayed information to the faculty. The President tried to stay in touch with faculty through bulletins and continued to hold faculty meetings; nevertheless the faculty was further removed from direct representation.

Faculty Council/Faculty Welfare Committee

The idea of establishing an organization to represent the faculty was introduced by President #1 in 1963 when he raised the possibility of establishing a Faculty Council to parallel the President's Advisory Council. The idea was not well received. The Dean of Academic Affairs discussed the President's proposal at a meeting with the division chairmen. The Dean considered the establishment of a faculty council unnecessary, because he thought that his regular meetings with the division chairmen were sufficient. The chairmen, all of whom were also faculty members, agreed with the Dean. One of the division chairmen challenged the whole idea of a faculty council, wondering "just what such a council could contribute to the College organizationally . . . . In what way would a faculty council facilitate greater understanding than merely consulting the whole faculty" (College Archives, Divisional Chairmen Meeting Minutes, Oct. 15, 1963, pp. 2-3).

Instead of a Faculty Council, the division chairman proposed establishing a Faculty Welfare Committee (College Archives, Divisional Chairmen Meeting Minutes, Oct. 15, 1963, pp. 2-3). At a Saturday faculty meeting, the first President formally approved "the forming of a Faculty Welfare Committee to work on all welfare problems of the faculty" (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Oct. 26, 1963, p. 1).

The Faculty Welfare Committee did not concern itself with faculty professional development. It was concerned with issues that a union would normally handle, i.e. wages, hours, and working conditions. For faculty these issues translated into salary, evaluation, tenure, promotion, teaching load, benefits, and academic rank.

The Faculty Welfare Committee viewed attending professional meetings as a means to find new faculty more than as a means to obtain professional development. The Committee recommended a "wider use of professional meetings for hiring" (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes, Nov. 19, 1965, p. 2). The Committee did raise some questions about sabbatical leave (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes, Dec. 3, 1965), and they recommended that the "department chairman should . . . take and integral role in the development and improvement of faculty" (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum to Executive Board of College Senate, Oct. 28, 1969, p. 6).

During the middle and late 1960s, the Faculty Welfare Committee's major concern was whether or not to tie academic rank to salary. The Committee thought that the faculty should have academic rank but that the faculty's salary scale should continue to be linked to the county teachers' salary scale. The Committee believed that as long as College faculty salaries were affiliated with the county teachers' pay scale, the College faculty would benefit from the bargaining power of the County Teachers Association. In a 1964 memorandum to the faculty, the Faculty Welfare Committee proposed that "faculty members should [receive] rank as another means of *professional recognition* [italics added] . . . . However . . . rank should be independent of salary and be based instead upon education" (College Archives, Apr. 29, 1964, p. 2).

The Faculty Welfare Committee recommended allocating rank according to academic degree coupled with "a minimum standard of experience . . . for the higher ranks" (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum, Apr. 29, 1964, p. 2). Eventually the issue of tying rank to salary was voted on and approved by the faculty (College Archives, Results of the Referendum Vote Memorandum, 1969). The Board of Trustees concurred and in February 1970 tied academic rank to salary, thereby formally disassociating the income of College faculty from the county public school teachers' pay scale.

At its first meeting for the 1965-66 academic year, the Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed a list of 17 subjects to work on during the year. Only one item on the list, "Sabbatical leave - What new and improved standards are required?" (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes, Nov. 19, 1965, pp. 1-2) was related to faculty professional development. The other subjects could be roughly categorized as salary, benefits and responsibilities. At the Committee's second meeting of the year, the Committee tabled the sabbatical leave question. They "agreed that the sabbatical leave question be put off until its place could be considered in the 5-year plan" (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes, Dec. 3, 1965, p. 1).

The Faculty Welfare Committee represented the faculty like a union, and seemed so disposed to having a unionized faculty that it arranged for the faculty to hear presentations from union representatives (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Chairman Memorandum to all faculty, Nov. 17, 1969). The Committee referenced the National Educators Association (NEA) and American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in their reports (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum to [President #1], Nov. 1964, p. 4). The committee advised President #3 that it planned to contact the AAUP to explore the possibility of establishing a chapter at the College (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum to [President #3] [Spring Report], 1966, p. 4). By 1968, a weak chapter of the AAUP was established (College Archives, Faculty Senate minutes, Oct. 5, 1968, p. 1).

The Faculty Welfare Committee communicated its positions on issues by submitting reports to the President. The spring 1966 report, which was presented to President #3 and the College Development Committee, reads like a document for negotiation with the professional development items in the report treated like bargaining chips. For example:

> Part I: College Development [emphasis added]
>
> Point 18 [of 18]: Faculty travel is covered in the Handbook [sic], section G-6. The faculty should travel for professional increase of competence and the encouragement of professional interests. The nature of the junior college predicts much local travel and such travel should not be restricted. Too, to certain meetings, wives should be allowed to accompany husbands at cost for per diem to them. (College

> Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum to [President #3] [Spring Report], 1966, p. 2)
>
> Part II: Proposals for 1966 [emphasis added]
>
> Point 2 [of 14]. Because the tenure and sabbatical questions depend on the autonomy of the college [the College president was still answerable to the county public schools superintendent], we suggest adopting the AAUP statements when such points become possible. (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum to [President #3] [Spring Report], 1966, p. 3)
>
> Part III: Future Programs [emphasis added]
>
> Point 2 [of 6]. We are trying to establish pertinent guidelines following the AAUP recommendations for Sabbaticals, Tenure, and the conduct of college business . . . .
>
> Point 4. We urge new elections, from divisions and from general faculty of [sic] spring faculty meeting (College Archives, Faculty Welfare Committee Memorandum to [President #3] [Spring Report], 1966, p. 4).

President #3 responded to the last request (III. 4.) several months later in President's Bulletin 1-66 by announcing to the faculty and staff that the members of the Faculty Welfare Committee were reappointed for the year "so that all assignments may be completed at this time. In future years, members of this Committee will be elected by the faculty in the Spring semester" (College Archives, Sept. 30, 1966, p. 1).

The College president controlled faculty meetings and activities: he called and presided over all faculty meetings, determined whether or not workshops would be held, and even decided when elections for the Faculty Welfare Committee would be held (College Archives, President's memorandum, May 23, 1966; College Archives, President's Bulletin 1-66, Sept. 30, 1966).

Faculty Senate

With issues of control at stake and "in response to the strained relations which had existed between the college administration and the faculty since 1965" (College Archives, Reflections on the History of the College Senate, Apr. 21, 1971, p. 2), the faculty felt that it needed more than the Faculty Welfare Committee to represent its interests. On May 13, 1967, the faculty passed four motions to create a Faculty Senate and an Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The faculty voted to "render itself a Senate and operate as such when participating in general meeting without administration present" (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, May 13, 1967, p. 2). The faculty voted to establish an Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to "provide an independent competent and enlightened leadership for the faculty" (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, May 13, 1967, p. 2). With the establishment of the Faculty Senate, the faculty became an independent body separate from the administration.

The Executive Board of the Faculty Senate sent a letter announcing the formation of the Faculty Senate to the Board of Trustees:

> Our teaching faculty with the knowledge and consent of [College President #4] has organized a Faculty Senate, and we enclose a copy of our constitution. A committee is presently working on by-laws, which will be sent to you as soon as they are presented to and passed by the Senate. Our Executive Board of six elected members at large and five elected representatives, one from each division, meet regularly to act on matters referred to it by the Senate and individual faculty members.
>
> We believe that the President of the College is the educational leader who should interpret to his faculty the wishes of the Board of Trustees and to the Board the desires of the faculty. We feel responsible for much of what goes on at [the College], where we are employed as educators and where the job we do in our classrooms is probably the largest single factor of importance in our students' education. Therefore we would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Board.
>
> We look forward to meeting with you, and in the meantime please know that the Executive Board is available to you for conference. (College Archives, Executive Board of the Faculty Senate letter to the Board of Trustees, Oct. 17, 1967)

While the letter acknowledged the role of the President, it also moved to establish a direct relationship with the Board of Trustees. The Executive Board of the

Faculty Senate met with the Board of Trustees during the summer of 1968. "Recommendations were made and a 10 page [sic] memorandum containing these recommendations was submitted to the Board of Trustees . . . . It was felt that a working relationship had been established" (College Archives, Faculty Senate minutes, Oct. 5, 1968 p. 1). The Faculty Senate's relationship with the Board of Trustees prompted President #4 to comment, "Normally the Board of Trustees works with the President rather than with the faculty" (College Archives, Faculty Senate minutes, Oct. 5, 1968, p. 1).

The Faculty Senate emphasized the importance of shared governance, however faculty members apparently did not participate as rigorously as the Chairman of the Faculty Senate thought was necessary. He chastised the faculty for a poor turnout at the statewide AAUP conference for two-year colleges that had been hosted at the College. He correlated attendance at the AAUP conference with professional self-respect, and he defined professional growth

> in terms of gaining a new and independent Board [of Trustees], of our pending accreditation, of administrative cooperation, of local and state political support, and of faculty competence . . . . [I]f we fumble the ball this close to the goal of a professionally administered institution we have only ourselves to blame. (College Archives, Faculty Senate Chairman's open letter to faculty, Nov. 25, 1968).

The College was working toward being accredited by the Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (Middle States).

The Faculty Senate realized the importance maintaining a good working relationship with both the Board of Trustees and the administration as they waited for accreditation. The Faculty Senate Chairman stressed that "the faculty should make every effort to work harmoniously with the administration because of the pending accreditation. Our chief goal should be to become an accredited institution" (College Archives, Faculty Senate minutes, Oct. 5, 1968, p. 1).

In a carryover from the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Faculty Senate through its Salary Committee continued to negotiate salaries and benefits (College Archives, Faculty Senate minutes, Oct. 5, 1968 p.2). Middle States criticized the Faculty Senate for acting "as a kind of labor union [adding that] the Faculty Senate should be the body, which makes the educational policy of the College" (College Archives, Faculty Senate minutes, March 3, 1969, p. 1). Middle States concluded that the Faculty Senate needed to be reconstituted to "include all elements of the professional staff [and that] many of the college committees should be incorporated within the Faculty Senate organization" (College Archives, Reflections on the History of the College Senate, Apr. 22, 1971, p. 2).

College Senate

In response to the Middle States recommendation, the faculty and the administration began crafting a more inclusive body to replace the two-year old Faculty Senate.

> During the spring semester of 1969, members of the faculty, working closely with members of the administration . . . [will be]attempting to create an organization which would further cooperation and unity. In addition, College President #4 gave implicit, and ultimately explicit support to the creation of this new organization. (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Apr. 30, 1969).[6]

The College Senate included members of the administration, members of the faculty, and representatives of the student body. A College Senate Executive Board was established to

> act on behalf of the entire College Senate and confer with the Administration and the Board of Trustees on all important matters pertaining to the College community . . . . [T]he President and Executive Board . . . establish committees not already established by the By-laws. (College Archives, Constitution of the College Senate of [the College], 1969, p.2).

The formation of the College Senate was established on the basic premise encouraged by Middle States that "the policy-making process of the institution should be a cooperative endeavor which directly involved the three major components of the college–administration, faculty, and students" (College Archives, College Senate Meeting Minutes, Oct. 29, 1970, p. 2). The College Senate constitution equalized the authority of the three groups by weakening the power of the President. The constitution specified that the Board of Trustees would arbitrate any policy differences between the College President and the College Senate:

---

[6] At the same time the new College Senate was being organized, President #4 outlined the function, guidelines and membership of the College Council that would replace the President's Advisory Council. He emphasized that no member of the Board of Trustees would serve on the Council, because the Board would have to act as a "court of appeals" if a majority of council members disagree with him (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Apr. 30, 1969, p. 1).

> A proposal approved by the Senate becomes official college policy when it is approved in writing by the President of the College. Proposals not approved by the President of the College will be returned to the Executive Board with a written explanation. The Executive Board shall then state its position in writing and forward the statement together with the proposal and the explanation of the president of the College to the Board of Trustees, who shall consider the matter at their next meeting. (College Archives, Constitution of the College Senate of [the College], 1969, p. 3)

To aid in governance, the College Senate established seven standing committees and assignments for each. Professional Development, formerly the Faculty Standards Committee, was one of the standing committees.[7] The Professional Development Committee was assigned to:

1. "establish well-designed and effectively conducted in-service programs
2. consider a summer studio program
3. develop programs geared toward innovative teaching
4. consider a resolution on accountability" (College Archives, College Senate Special Meeting Minutes, Sept. 3, 1970, p.4).

---

[7] The others were Academic Regulations and Standards; Budget; Community Services; Curriculum; learning Resources; Rank, Salary, and Tenure, formerly the Faculty Welfare Committee; and Student Services (College Senate Meeting Minutes, October 29, 1970)

However, the actual tasks given to the Professional Development Committee differed substantially from the written assignments: "The Professional Development Committee has been charged with the review of the faculty evaluation package, the review of promotion criteria, the review of personnel policies, and to become involved through and/or in cooperation with [President #4] on administration evaluation," (College Archives, Vice President, Student Government Association, Memorandum to student members of the College Senate and Committee Chairman, Oct. 1971).

College Senate and President #4.

The College Senate began to assume significant authority for itself. The College Senate Appointments Committee dictated the

> priority for consideration in selecting an Academic Dean [explaining] that the Academic Dean works within the framework of educational policy established by the College Senate, in cooperation with the Board of Trustees, and is responsible for implementation of established policies and recommendation of new policies. (College Archives, College Senate Appointments Committee memorandum, 1967 p. 1).

The committee identified six areas of responsibility for an Academic Dean.

One of the six areas was Faculty Development. The Appointments Committee directed that a Dean should give greater emphasis to faculty development, specifying the need for:

> a. a more effective program of faculty orientation so that faculty members have a clearer picture of what is expected of them.
>
> b. greater stimulation and encouragement of promising teachers.
>
> c. working with departmental chairmen in evaluation of teaching and teaching programs and instituting measures to help the less successful. (College Archives, College Senate Appointments Committee memorandum, 1967, p. 2)

The formation of the College Senate did not have the desired effect of improving the relations between President #4, his administrative staff and the faculty. The College Senate believed that the President did not adequately present the Senate's position to the Board of Trustees, with the resulting consequences that "the board has not always understood the problems in their proper context and not always been able to act with complete understanding of the situation" (College Archives, Reflections on the History of the College Senate, Apr. 22, 1971, p. 4). The relationship deteriorated even further when the President and his Administrative Council "chose to disassociate themselves from the Senate, and instead of providing the Senate a link to the Administration, . . . left the Senate to function in ignorance of administrative viewpoints" (College Archives, Reflections on the History of the College Senate, Apr. 22, 1971, p. 4).

The College Senate's position was that it "shared authority and responsibility [with the administration] for educational policy making, involving the administration, faculty, and students" (College Archives, College Senate Memorandum, 1971, p. 2).

The schism between the Faculty Senate and the administration created a governance problem: "Some groups within the college have found they can get their policies implemented without consulting the Senate at all. Other groups who have been greeted unsympathetically by the administration have found the 'Senate' route most advantageous" (College Archives, College Senate Memorandum, 1971, p. 4).

Tension between the college administration and the College Senate grew to the point that a private firm was retained to conduct an independent study of college governance. The firm reported "that the College Senate 'surpasses those powers ordinarily found in a faculty senate or, for that matter, a traditional 'academic council'!" (College Archives, McManis Associates, 1970, p. IV-5). The firm determined that the existing structure was undesirable and recommended "that the role, scope and responsibility of the College Senate should be reevaluated" (College Archives, McManis Associates, 1970, p. IV-6).

The College Senate emphatically rejected the recommendation, retorting that the College Senate had been formed in response to a Middle States recommendation as a means to "eliminate the division of functions between the administration and the faculty" (College Archives, Restructuring and Re-evaluation of the College Senate, 1971, p. 3). The College Senate summarized its position:

> What the matter comes down to basically is a philosophy of leadership for service. Administrators would see themselves as accountable to the college community as a whole, working within the limitations imposed by the Board [of Trustees]. The college community that is being served should be first and

> foremost kept in mind. With this philosophy of leadership, it is difficult to see how an administrator could be opposed to a Senate structure that so handily provides a vehicle for input from the entire college community. (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Feb. 19, 1969, p. 6)

College Senate and President #5.

The College Senate and the College Senate Executive Board remained intact--as did the tension between the administration and faculty. When President #5 took office, he tried to reduce this tension. One of his first meetings was with the Executive Council of the College Senate to discuss campus governance. President #5 held the position that "the role of the Board [of Trustees] was not to solve our daily problems or provide answers, but rather to deal with overall policy affecting the College" (College Archives, Executive Board Minutes, July 20, 1971, p. 1). The President further urged "various elements of the College Community [to] resolve differences of opinion . . . before presenting policy recommendations and alternatives to the Board" (p. 1). He also felt that

> it is important for the college to determine first of all, who should be involved in making what decision, and secondly, find out who has the expertise and capabilities to make that decision . . . . Persons or groups directly affected by an important decision should have a role in making the particular decision. (p. 1)

He then advised that that those involved in making decision needed to "do their 'homework' in developing their input before the decision is made" (p. 1).

As discussed earlier, President #5 was actively involved with faculty professional development. Because he was so actively involved, the College Senate's Professional Development Committee petitioned the College Senate's Executive Board to revise its charge:

> In light of the current administrative trend toward professional development and innovation, this Committee sees its role as provider of input in the determination of needs, standards, program design and budget as it relates to professional development. The Committees should, therefore, be involved with the Administration in the area of planning for academic and professional development. (College Archives, Professional Development Committee Memorandum to Membersof Executive Board, Nov. 18, 1971)

The College Senate Executive Board approved the request (Minutes, Nov 18, 1971).

The Professional Development Committee submitted a second petition a month later (December 1971) proposing a resolution to endorse the President's Innovative Travel Fund and urgingthat it become a permanent fund:

> In view of the fact that the Professional Development Committee of the College Senate feels that the Innovative Travel Fund is commensurate with the Professional Development activities, this Committee commends President [#5] on the implementationof the Innovative Travel Fund and requests that he consider making it a permanent practice and to consider expansion in the

> future. (College Archives, College Senate Executive Board Minutes, Jan. 6, 1972, p. 1)

The resolution passed. Even though the College Senate commended President #5 for his Innovative Travel Program, the relationship was strained. The President wanted the "the [S]enate committees to develop and forward their rationales and background material on action items to him via the College Senate" (College Archives, College Senate Executive Board Minutes, Dec. 2, 1971, p. 1). The College Senate Executive Board reacted by proposing a "model Bill of Rights and Responsibilities proposed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education" (College Archives, College Senate President Memorandum to College Senate members, May 2, 1972). The Bill of Rights was eventually included in the Faculty Handbook.

Some points of cooperation between the College Senate and the President did exist. The College Senate cooperated when the President asked it to "work with the faculty in developing some recommendations for revising the faculty evaluation system. [The President noted that] faculty and administrators have indicated to me that the current system has serious weaknesses and is in need of revision" (College Archives, President #5 Memorandum to College Senate President, Jan. 19, 1972). The weaknesses in the system had been problematic since 1965 when President #3 eliminated the students' evaluation of faculty from the plan (College Archives, President's Bulletin 7-65, Oct. 29, 1965).

The faculty, the President and the Board of Trustees recognized faculty evaluation as a determinate for contract renewal, tenure and promotion. The President said that he believed that revising the faculty evaluation system was "primarily the faculty's responsibility to develop and present for administrative and board reaction . . . [as he] and other administrators stand ready to assist in these matters upon your request" (College Archives, President's Bulletin 7-65, Oct. 29, 1965). The College Senate assigned the project to the Professional Development Committee and the Rank, Tenure and Salary Committee.

The two College Senate subcommittees proposed a policy in which a panel evaluating the faculty member would consider four weighted criteria: the applicant's self-evaluation: 10%, the immediate superior's evaluation: 20%, students' evaluation: 40%, and a professional activities evaluation: 30%, Seven acceptable professional development activities were specified in the policy:

1. "additional course work
2. related summer employment
3. publications and research
4. active work in professional associations
5. [C]ollege [S]enate and/or other committee activities
6. development of constructive source materials
7. other activities including community activities" (College Archives, College Ad Hoc committee on Promotion Procedures, 1972).

The two subcommittees further recommended the establishment of a College Senate Committee that would select faculty who merited promotion (College Archives, Faculty Promotion Policy, Aug. 1, 1972). The College Senate Executive Board approved the new policy in an 8-1-1 vote and put it before the whole Senate. The College Senate President urged the Senate members to approve the policy prior to its presentation to the Board of Trustees, offering several compelling reasons:

- He feared that if faculty did not approve the new policy no promotions would be made the next year, and the faculty risked having the decision on promotion policy made other than through the College Senate.
- The policy was subject to revision. The faculty was "not bound to it."
- Promotions could be granted in fall 1972 to those who should have been considered for promotion in 1971. (College Archives, College Senate President Memorandum to all College Senate Members, Aug. 1, 1972)

The College Senate members apparently approved the policy. It was adopted by the Board of Trustees with a minor adjustment (College Archives, College Senate President Memorandum College Senate Members, Sept. 26, 1972).

Meanwhile, the Professional Development subcommittee of the College Senate was tackling the problem of providing faculty professional activities along with the other assignments it had received:

> The committee is currently studying various plans to have regular professional development workshops and attempting to secure a regular budget for this type of activity. Other charges to the committee include determination of what

> duties will be required of faculty when students are not on campus, and job descriptions for faculty. (College Archives, College Senate Newsletter, 1(2), Nov. 1972, p.2)

In addition to preparing job descriptions for teaching faculty, the College Senate Executive Board charged the Professional Development Committee with preparing job descriptions for the Learning Resource Center faculty, i.e. librarians, counselors, and Department Chairmen (College Archives, College Senate Executive Board Minutes, Sept. 21, 1972).

The Professional Development Committee provided information about available funding. It also provided and solicited information about professional development opportunities:

> The Professional Development Committee wishes to point out the availability of the $100.00 per faculty member that is allocated for attending conferences. The list of conferences that follow [list of eleven conferences omitted from this paper] have been contributed by members of the Professional Development Committee. We would like to solicit contributions from other members of the community concerning conferences you think may be of interest to others. (College Archives, College Senate Newsletter, 1(3), Dec. 1972, p. 3)

College Senate and President #6.

As the Professional Development Committee was going about its assignments, the College underwent a sudden change in leadership: President #6 replaced President #5 in mid-semester. President #6 did not accord faculty professional development the same priority as his predecessor had. He announced that a day of orientation would be held on campus with the possibility of an outdoor picnic, and all day meetings. Holding the orientation day on campus was a marked contrast to the lavish orientation days that President #5 had held off campus in hotels.

When President #6 met with the College Senate Executive Board he told them that he expected to have "a completely open administration with the full participation of the faculty, students and classified employees in the decision making process" (College Archives, College Senate Executive Board Minutes, Nov. 21, 1972, p. 1). Funding shortfalls provided the first test of cooperation. The second test involved the new faculty evaluation plan that had been initiated by President #5.

President #6 was faced with making budget cuts. The College Senate gave the president a priority list of ten items to be funded and a list of four items to be cut. Sabbaticals were number 10 on the funding list. Eliminating "conference travel for everyone, except that in the President's Budget," was number 3 on the list of items to cut (College Archives, College Senate Newsletter, 1(4), Mar. 1973, p. 1). President #6 ignored the College's Senate request to fund sabbaticals: he cut funding for sabbaticals and for conference travel. Some professional development activities were preserved. The Professional Development Committee prepared three workshops for the semester, and was working on an orientation program for fall 1973 (College Archives, College Senate Newsletter, 1(4), Mar. 1973, p. 1). The first test of cooperation between the College Senate and President #6 resulted in a standoff.

The second test came after the President received recommendations from 157 faculty and administrators to improve the 1972 tenure and promotion evaluation system, which had been adopted by President #5. Without conferring with the College Senate, the President appointed an Administrative Review Board to work up new guidelines and procedures for tenure and promotion. The Review Board included three faculty members appointed by the College Senate (College Archives, College Senate Meeting Minutes, May 10, 1973). The task was undertaken with urgency because the Board of Trustees had temporarily suspended granting faculty promotion and tenure pending receipt of the revised plan.

The combination of the suspension of promotion and tenure, the elimination of sabbaticals, and the President making decisions without conferring with the College Senate was so offensive that the College Senate appointed an ad hoc committee to investigate union membership. Cooperation between President #6 and the College Senate was near meltdown. In a letter to College Senate members, the ad hoc committee strongly urged union affiliation because:

> faculty decision-making (e.g., a College Senate) are [sic] being bypassed while the important decisions are made at the level of bureaucracy . . . . Decisions affecting the life of the college as an academic community are not being based on educational criteria but on management criteria. A College

> Senate has no legal basis for existence outside of the policies of the college; hence it exists on the sufferance of the power structure. Lacking power of enforcement, adequate financial sources, and outside resources and support, a Senate is ultimately unable to require the power structure to deal seriously with its proposals.
>
> That the above is happening at the College is illustrated by the decisions freezing tenure and promotions, eliminating cost of living increases and sabbaticals, and raising teaching loads. That our form of governance has outlived its usefulness is amply illustrated by the negative decisions made on these matters. Lacking legal stature, financial resources, and even legal representation, we have been relegated to a suggestive body often asked to sanction decisions already made.
>
> Committee recommends to the College Senate that:
>
> 1. chapter of NEA be established on campus
> 2. . . . payroll deduction plan [be instituted]
> 3. faculty members of NEA draft constitution for local chapter
> 4. local chapter be represented on College Senate Executive Board
> 5. non-eligible personnel consider off-campus affiliation. (College Archives, Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Professional Affiliation, Chairman's letter to Senate Members, Aug. 6, 1973)

The College Senate suppoted the ad hoc committee's recommendation that a NEA chapter be established, but ould not act on it because the establishment of a union at the College required state-enabling legislation[8] (College Archives, College Senate Meeting Minutes, Sept. 4, 1973).

Capturing the spirit of the time, the Professional Development Committee sponsored a collective bargaining simulation workshop. The simulation was directed by a "personnel consultant for the Dearborn, Michigan School System" (College Archives, College Senate Meeting Minutes, May 7, 1974, p.3).

In spite of the differences between the College Senate and the President, the work of revising the Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Plan was completed. The revised plan was considered an initial step toward a comprehensive, open-ended growth and development plan subject to annual review. The revised faculty evaluation plan was based on five assumptions, one of which was the availability of faculty professional development. The College Senate emphasized the importance of professional development opportunities in its introduction to the 1973 revision of the 1972 Promotion, Tenure and Performance Evaluation Package: "Since this system focuses upon increasing effectiveness, opportunities for professional development and self-renewal should be available to every faculty member in some way, be it [sic] sabbaticals, research, workshops, or scholarships" (College Archives, College Senate President Memorandum to College Senate Members, Nov. 29, 1973, p. 1). The Board of Trustees accepted the 1973 Evaluation Plan[9] (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Sept. 24, 1974) and reinstated tenure and promotions.

---

[8] In spring 2001 enabling legislation was passed for classified personnel, but not faculty.

[9] The Tenure and Promotion Plan would undergo numerous revisions over the next 20 years.

With the acceptance of the Plan and the reinstatement of promotion and tenure, the College Senate's relationship with President #6 began to stabilize, but the College Senate was becoming less cohesive. The classified staff "elected to form a separate organization with a direct voice to the Board of Trustees" (College Archives, Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization of the College Senate, Sept. 10, 1974, p. 1). The Student Body already had its Student Government Association; the Administrative Staff was studying the possibility of forming its own organization, which "would leave the College Senate in the ambiguous position of being the faculty's only representation to the Board of Trustees, while at the same time remaining an organization purporting to speak for the College Community as a whole" (p. 1).

The President of the College Senate said that "the faculty was disillusioned and disappointed with the [College] Senate, and that this in turn was caused by an unrealistic expectation of results" (College Archives, College Senate Special Meeting Minutes of Sept. 10, 1974, p. 1).

Faculty Organization.

On November 26, 1974, the College Senate passed two resolutions to submit to the Board of Trustees for approval. One resolution dissolved the College Senate effective January 31, 1975. The second requested the Board of Trustees to officially recognize the Faculty Senate, the Administrative Staff Organization, the Classified Staff Organization, and the Student Governance Organization "as the organizations wherein faculty, administrative staff, classified staff, and students respectively have the means of participating in policy formation and policy implementation" (College Archives, College Senate Agenda, Nov. 26, 1974).

At its December 17, 1974 meeting, the Board of Trustees approved the College Senate's request, and authorized the College President, "in the best interests of the college, to involve the [F]aculty [O]rganization, the [A]dministrative [S]taff [O]rganization, the [C]lassified [S]taff [O]rganization, and the [S]tudent [G]overnment [O]rganization in the formation and implementation of college policies affecting their respective constituencies" (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Dec. 17, 1974).

The College now had four distinct constituency groups. These groups formed a small Coordinating Council as a means of communicating with each other, the President and the Board of Trustees (College Archives, College Senate Special Meeting Minutes, Sept. 10, 1974).

The former College Senate President became the Interim President of the Faculty Organization. According to the by-laws, the Faculty Organization existed "to provide for improvement of the learning processes at the College, including but not limited to provision for representation of the faculty viewpoint in decision-making at the College; and promotion of the well-being of all faculty members," (Faculty Organization Interim President's Memorandum to all Full-Time Faculty Members, Nov. 21, 1974).

The Faculty Organization, which consisted of the entire faculty, elected faculty members to serve as their representatives on the Faculty Senate. The elected President of the Faculty Organization presided over the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Organization, working through the Faculty Senate, could operate independently of the other three constituent groups. Even so, the interim Faculty Organization President cautioned that the faculty "should not expect better results or more power in an absolute sense from the establishment of a separate faculty organization, but that they would at least gain a clearly defined faculty voice, separate from those of the other groups" (College Archives, College Senate Special Meeting Minutes, Sept. 10, 1974).

With the establishment of the Faculty Organization the in-house newsletter, The College Senate Memo, became The Faculty Senate Memo, committed to reporting news and commenting editorially from a faculty viewpoint, "always open, however, to differing expressions of opinion" (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 1(1), Jan. 20, 1975, p. 1). This edition of the Memo reported the autonomy accorded to the constituency groups:

> [T]he Board [of Trustees] did not intend that "any of these [constituency] groups have to wait for the president of the college to initiate action concerning suggestions or recommendations from their organizations. However, the Board wants it understood that before official action is taken on any recommendation it must go through the Office of the President. You [the constituency groups] have the unabridged right to make suggestions to the Board and we will always honor the right. (pp. 1-2)

The collegewide Professional Development Committee did not survive the dissolution of the College Senate. A faculty member remembers:

> When the constituencies each went their own way, they deliberately set up some collegewide committees. But they did not do that for professional development. It just completely fell through the cracks and so the Faculty Senate created its own Professional Development Committee, but it was no longer collegewide. It no longer had participation by other than faculty, and so things really started to go a different route at that point. (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997)

The Faculty Senate established a Professional Development Team by appointing the faculty members who had served on the College Senate Professional Development Committee to be the Faculty Senate Professional Development Team (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 1(1), Apr. 18, 1975, p. 2). One of the first professional development activities conducted by the Faculty Senate Professional Development Team was an all-day Saturday workshop to train Faculty Senate delegates and alternates. The workshop included "small-group workshops on governance on campus, communications with constituents, hierarchies, and methods of aligning jobs" (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 2(4), Sept. 5, 1975, p. 2). During the workshop, delegates were asked to identify three areas "as the most important things the Senate should concern itself with this year" (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 2(6), Oct. 3, 1975, p. 1). The top three items identified were collective bargaining, revisions in the Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Plan, and faculty apathy. Faculty professional development was not mentioned.

The Faculty Senate took up the issue of collective bargaining: it supported a state bill which was opposed by the Board of Trustees. The bill would "enable the faculty of our college to engage in collective bargaining" (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 2(7), Oct. 31, 1975, pp. 102). Collective bargaining, benefits, and faculty rights–not professional development–occupied the Faculty Senate.

In a short time, faculty became less interested in the Faculty Senate and its issues. A little less than a year and a half after the Faculty Senate was established, the Faculty Senate Memo began urging faculty to "to commit of themselves strongly to the Faculty Senate" (College Archives, Apr. 1976, p. 2). This edition of the Memo lamented the lack of competition in Faculty Senate elections, recited some of the faculty's complaints about the Faculty Senate, and then countered them. Some faculty thought that the Faculty Senate was ineffective, had no power, that its recommendations were ignored by the administration, and that "no one wants to stick his neck out to get involved with it [the Faculty Senate]" (p. 2). The Memo then countered the complaints:

> The Faculty Senate is what we have. We do not yet have a union to represent us; we do not yet have any other way of making our wishes known. If we sabotage the Senate by refusing to run for office, by refusing to vote for candidates, then we will have nothing. (p. 2)

The Faculty Senate began taking bold steps:

- It approved a plan for hiring a lawyer to represent the faculty. Each faculty member would be asked to pay $10 into a legal fund to pay the lawyer (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 2(17), May 14, 1976).
- The Faculty Senate's new President "stated his intention as president to make every effort to open up communication with the College community. He takes the position that there is no reason for the Faculty Senate to hide what it is doing, and that it should likewise try to persuade others not to hide things form the Faculty. (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 3(1), June 18, 1976, p. 1)
- The Faculty Senate tried to muster legislative support for collective bargaining enabling legislation (College Archives, Faculty Senate President's Memorandum, Feb. 12, 1976).
- It developed a reduction in force (RIF) policy (College Archives, Faculty Senate President's Memorandum, Aug. 31, 1977).

The Faculty Senate did support some professional development activities. In 1979 it decided to sponsor a Distinguished Guest Program. It began planning the program by asking faculty what topics would interest them (College Archives, Faculty Senate President's Memorandum, Oct. 30, 1979). In general the Faculty Senate was too involved with other issues to be very concerned about faculty professional development. In fact, by the middle 1980s, members of the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee considered the Faculty Senate "a kind of a road block" (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997).

From the middle 1980s through the middle 1990s, the Faculty Senate was occupied with two major issues: on-going revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Plan, and working through unprecedented budget cuts. In December 1990 the Faculty Senate President called an emergency faculty meeting. He told the faculty, "The college community is facing a financial crisis that is unprecedented. The State of Maryland has asked all community colleges to give back to the State between 10-15% of this current year's appropriation" (College Archives, Faculty Senate President's Memorandum to all Full-Time Faculty, Dec. 11, 1990). The Faculty Senate did not oppose the administration's decision to raise some fees and tuition, and to remove from the College Code "the provision which specifically mandates a 4% [annual] increase in salary for those college employees not currently at the top of their salary schedule" (College Archives, Faculty Senate President's Memorandum to all Faculty, Feb. 14, 1991).

The Faculty Senate did not discuss cuts that had a direct impact on professional development. Funding for the Local Travel budget was reduced from $16,552 in FY84 to $2,200 in FY88 (College Archives, FY84 General Current Operating Budget, p. 205; College Archives, FY88 General Current Operating Budget, unnumbered page). Funding for Meetings and Conferences was reduced from $43,013 in FY84 to $25,655 in FY89. In FY89 Funding for Staff Development Leave was eliminated from the budget (College Archives, FY89 General Current Operating Budget).

As a substitute for the Staff Development Leave program, the Faculty Senate proposed, and the Board of Trustees accepted, the Leave Banking program as a means to provide faculty with long-term professional development time. The Faculty Senate President explained the program to the faculty:

> [The] purpose [of the Leave Banking program is] to encourage and facilitate faculty professional development by providing a mechanism in which future reduced load or a semester's professional leave can be planned for and earned in advance. The teaching load reduction or leave which accrues to a participating faculty member in an agreed upon semester shall be used for personal development activities at the discretion of the faculty member in accordance with a personal professional development plan outlining the planned activities and their contribution to the faculty member's growth and development, which is submitted with the application may not be earned . . . more than once in any seven year period. (College Archives, Faculty Senate President's Memorandum to all Full-Time Faculty, Mar. 29, 1990).

By 1995, with the worst of the budget problems behind it, the Faculty Senate was once more caught up in a Board of Trustees demand for a major overhaul of the Faculty Evaluation Plan. The revisions would consume the majority of the Senate's time for the next two years. While the Faculty Senate wrestled with the problem du jour, its Professional Development Committee continued to function, albeit with or without the Faculty Senate's approval.

Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee.

The Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee was philosophical about its existence, believing that it had to exist because the College did not take professional development seriously. A former member of the Committee supported this position by explaining that if the College were serious about professional development it never would have been dropped when the College Senate was dissolved. His described the College's attitude toward professional development as "just something on paper that you have to do and so it has to be somewhere. So it fell to the Faculty Senate because there wasn't an institutional priority for it" (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997).

Other College actions caused the Committee to question the College's commitment to faculty professional development. In 1994, when the administration named one person to be the Coordinator of both the Cross-Cultural Education Advisory Council and of campuswide professional development, the Faculty Senate Faculty Professional Development Committee wondered again "just how deep the college commitment to professional development is" (College Archives, Faculty Professional Development Committee Meeting Minutes, Feb. 3, 1994, p. 1). When the College's Calendar Committee shortened the fall 1995 professional development week to three days "the committee found it to be another restriction on what professional development week would be able to do" (College Archives, Faculty Professional Development Committee Meeting Minutes, Apr. 21, 1994, p. 1).

Sometimes the fall professional development week, which the Committee helped to plan, had limited time available for professional development activities. In Fall 1994 "the main presentations . . . of professional development week will be Middle States' Committee reports" (College Archives, Faculty Professional Development Committee Meeting Minutes, Apr. 21, 1994, p. 1). Traditional professional development activities were relegated to later in the week. These activities included a program sponsored by Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and the African American Book Club (p. 1).

The Committee was concerned about the conflict between the timing of the spring professional development activities and the annual Association of Faculty for the Advancement of Community College Teaching (AFACCT) conference (College Archives, Faculty Professional Development Committee Meeting Minutes, Nov. 18, 1983, p. 1). The Committee wrote to the Vice President for Instruction urging him to more actively encourage faculty attendance at the annual January meetings, and when the AFACCT and campus schedule conflicted to exempt faculty from on-campus activities to attend AFACCT. The Professional Development Committee petitioned the Dean to allow faculty to be involved in fewer professional development days by allowing "the faculty to carry over their days of attendance at AFACCT to the days of the professional development week even when AFACCT precede[d] our Professional Development week" (College Archives, Faculty Professional Development Committee Meeting Minutes, Apr. 21, 1994, p. 2).

The Professional Development Committee of the Faculty Senate thought of itself as a "rogue committee" because it "rarely did much of anything with [the] Faculty Senate. They [the Faculty Senate] would send us charges . . . we would talk about [them]" (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997). The Committee was not responsive to the Faculty Senate because they did not believe that the Faculty Senate was supportive of them. Instead of responding to the Faculty Senate, the Committee chose to determine the kind of programs the faculty needed by surveying the faculty "every five years or so we would survey to death" (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997).

In the early 1980s the Faculty Senate Faculty Professional Development Committee cultivated a relationship with the Assistant to the Dean of Academic Affairs who was in charge of professional development.

> We fostered a relationship and we did a lot of things . . . .The . . . Professional Development Committee . . . played a distinct role in helping to design and form those programs, but we weren't charged with the responsibility for it [sic]. . . . The Committee acted as sort of a sounding board and assisted. (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997).

The Committee was frustrated with the limitations placed on the fall orientation programs. They were told:

> the administration did not want to undertake anything very heavy in the fall because everybody was coming back from the summer. And all of the administrators were really busy starting up a new semester and getting

> registration going. So they wanted it to be more of a get-together, get reacquainted, more of a social thing. Not strictly social but they did want any heavy meaty issues which the administrators would have to pay attention to because they were busy doing other things. Spring semester was considered the time to raise more weighty things. But then we started conflicting with AFACCT. We had made a commitment to participate in AFACCT and so our spring program started dying on the vine too because we just conflicted with other things. (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997)

When the College received a Title III grant, the Professional Development Committee cooperated in a two-year study to develop "a model of faculty excellence." The study involved Master Teacher Retreats and using

> a format similar to that of a DACUM in using the terms 'duty' and 'task' to designate broad and specific responsibilities which can be defined as behaviors, and in listing underlying knowledge, skills, traits, and attitudes separately at the end. (College Archives, Faculty Professional Development Committee Memorandum to Full-Time Faculty Members, Mar. 2, 1992).

The retreats and the DACUM resulted in the identification of five major professional development areas of interest to the faculty. The College developed a brochure that defined the five areas and categorized each of the professional development activities it offered into one of them:

Intellectual Development

Programs designed to enhance individual skills, attitudes, knowledge, and performance related to academic disciplines.

Individual Development

Programs designed to enhance individual skills, attitudes, knowledge, and performance related to personal growth.

Instructional Development

Programs designed to enhance individual skills, attitudes, knowledge, and performance related to teaching.

Institutional Development

Programs designed to enhance individual skills, attitudes, knowledge, and performance related to general institutional efficiency and effectiveness.

Integration

Programs that cross the boundaries of intellectual, instructional, individual and institutional development.

A total of 35 different events and activities were distributed among the five categories (College Archives, Faculty Development Opportunities, Feb. 24, 1992).

The committee advocated for a professional development day in the middle of the semester when the College would close. It also advocated release time for a Professional Development Coordinator whose charge would include planning professional development for all faculty instead of being limited to teaching faculty.

In time the College would implement both recommendations, but not before the Faculty Professional Development Committee members became discouraged and dissolved the committee because of the College's seeming unwillingness to implement what the committee advocated. A former committee member recalled:

> We finally had come to the conclusion that maybe the best way to get a collegewide committee was to stop functioning as a faculty committee . . . . We really perceived that we were in a "Catch 22" as a faculty development committee. [The Vice President for Instruction] wouldn't take action because we were a Faculty Senate Committee, and we were convinced that Faculty Senate wasn't going to take action. So we finally decided to just call it quits. (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997)

Another former committee member explained, "We deliberately abdicated the authority of doing the planning because it was feeling like whatever we planned, in fact never ended up" (personal communication, Sept. 23, 1997).

Professional Development Council.

After the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee dissolved, the Professional Development Council was established by the administration (note: some people still refer to the council as a committee). According to a former Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee member, "The Professional Development Committee [sic] surfaced during the last collegewide evaluation accreditation. We killed ourselves [i.e. dissolved the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee] just before that occurred" (personal communication, Sept. 23, 1997).

The former committee member implied that the College had to have a professional development structure of some kind to satisfy accrediting requirements, so that when the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee self-destructed, the President formed the Professional Development Council. However, the Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs disagreed. While she knew that the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee had disbanded prior to the formation of the Professional Development Council, she believed the committee disbanded to become part of the council: "It was my understanding that they were going to incorporate themselves into this [the council]. And that's what they did" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998).

After the Faculty Senate's Professional Development Committee dissolved itself, the Faculty Senate did not try to reestablish another one. Professional development was left in the hands of the Professional Development Coordinator, a position that lasted until the Title III money was gone (personal communication, Sept. 29, 1997). Then faculty professional development was completely in the hands of the administrators.

In 1997 when the current Vice President for Instruction took office, she formed the three-person Professional Development Team by providing release time for two of the members, and appointing the third member as full-time Coordinator. Within a year of taking office she created Teaching and Learning Center and appointed the Coordinator of the Professional Development Team to be the director of the Center. She terminated the collegewide Professional Development Council and the related Coordinator's position. Three years later she would re-establish a collegewide Professional Development Council presided over by the director of the Teaching and Learning Center. She initiated open forum "chats" with the faculty that allow her to put ideas and issues before the faculty and get feedback. She established a faculty technology center equipped with state-of-the-art equipment and a technician as a part of the Teaching and Learning Center. Thus, the Vice President for Instruction began doing much of what the Faculty Senate's Professional Development Committee had hoped to do.

Summary: Faculty Representatives' Perspectives

With the exception of the Faculty Senate's Faculty Professional Development subcommittee, professional development was never a priority with the various groups that have represented the faculty as other events and situations occupied their time. The Faculty Senate's Faculty Professional Development Committee was a strong advocate of faculty professional development, but it lacked the authority and funds to initiate its ideas. The best it could do was to assist the Academic Assistant to the Vice President for Instruction who had the responsibility for planning and implementing professional development activities. The Faculty Senate's decision not to re-establish a Faculty Professional Development Committee after the committee dissolved itself is a strong indicator of the limited value accorded to faculty professional development by faculty representatives.

Outside Stakeholders' Perspectives

Several organizations outside of the College have different degrees of authority and influence over the College. The Board of Trustees has local policymaking authority. The Commission for Higher Education Middle States Association for Colleges and Schools has accreditation authority. The Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), which succeeded the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, has State policymaking authority and influences the State funding of colleges. The Maryland Association of Community Colleges (MACC) lobbies the State on behalf of community colleges. Each organization has influenced the actions of the College in ways that may have affected faculty professional development. Each organization is discussed in turn.

Board of Trustees

When the Community College was founded in 1958 the county school system's Board of Education was named as the College's local governing board. Under this arrangement, the Chief Executive Officer of the Community College, who first held the title of Dean, was accountable to the Superintendent of Schools, who reported to the Board of Education. The annual reports submitted by the Dean were included as part of the school system's annual report to the Board of Education. The Board of Education, accustomed to the public school system governance and unfamiliar with college governance, gave no guidelines to the Dean (College Archives, Ramplin, 1984).

In 1961 the Board of Education established a governance model for the Community College that was appropriate for an institution of higher education. It created a Board of Trustees for the College and changed the title of the College's Chief Executive Officer from Dean to President (McManis Associates, 1970, p. I-3). The Board of Education served as the College's Board of Trustees by sitting as the Board of Trustees when it was dealing with community college matters and having the President of the College report directly to it. Nevertheless, the College was still under the public school governance system until 1969, when the Maryland legislature authorized the establishment of a Board of Trustees separate from the Board of Education. The governor appointed seven individuals who were not affiliated with the Board of Education to serve as the College's Board of Trustees: "In July 1969 the College was placed under the governance of its own independent Board of Trustees" (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 1).

The authority of the Board of Trustees had been defined clearly by the State legislature, but the precise role of the Board of Trustees had not (College Archives, McManis Associates, 1970, p. III-1). Imprecise responsibilities and blurred lines of authority among the Board of Trustees, the College President, and the faculty created a power struggle between the President and the College Senate that was exacerbated in 1970 when the Chairman of the Board of Trustees "announced a reorganization of the Board whereby each member will act as liaison with the various components of the College" (College Archives, Trustee Topics, July 13, 1970, p. 1). McManis Associates reported that the liaison system "resulted in by-passing the President of the College and undermining his administrative authority" (College Archives, 1970, p. III-1). For a time, the President's authority was so seriously undermined that the Board of Trustees tabled a request from the President "to create the position of Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs pending a recommendation from the College Senate" (College Archives, Trustee Topics, June 15, 1970, p. 2).

McManus Associates cited the College Senate as having "an inordinately strong influence in the formulation of policies and procedures" (College Archives, 1970, p. IV-5). College lore has it that the influence of the College Senate on the Board of Trustees was a contributing factor to the resignation of the fifth President. The College Senate's influence was curbed in April 1973 when the Board of Trustees "approved the delegation of powers to the President" (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Apr. 10, 1973, p. 1).

The Board of Trustees actively inquired into topics ranging from curriculum development to progress on the College catalog (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Apr. 21, 1970, p. 1). However, it appeared to have little curiosity about faculty professional development. The Board occasionally heard about faculty professional development events at its meetings when it listened to reports commending various College faculty and staff members for their work on seminars, workshops, and faculty orientation (College Archives, Board of Trustees' Meeting Minutes, June 19, 1973; College Archives, Board of Trustees' Meeting Minutes, Aug. 28, 1973).

For the most part, the Board simply approved or disapproved professional development requests. It granted leaves of absence (College Archives, Trustee Topics, May 12, 1970). It passed a tuition reimbursement policy for full-time College employees (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Dec. 1, 1970, and it approved funding for several professional development items requested by the fifth President. These requests included "$3000 for three one-week workshops for College administrators, $450 for a one-year group subscription to the Junior College Journal for full-time faculty and administration, and $4,000 to establish an innovative travel fund" (College Archives, Board of Trustees' Meeting Minutes, July 26, 1971, p. 4). The Board approved the fourth President's request for $20,000 used in FY 1972-73 for "the establishment of the Educational Progress Research Grant Program" (College Archives, Trustee Topics, May 8, 1972, p. 1). The Board also granted the request of a faculty member to be on leave without pay for one semester so he could use his National Endowment Fellowship (p. 2).

When the President of the College Senate suggested that the Board consider policy changes necessary to meet some of the five-year professional development objectives such as developing "the teaching techniques to be used in the future," the Board passed the suggestion back to the College Senate, saying that ". . . the College Senate should look into teaching methodology and requested a position paper on this matter" (College Archives, Board of Trustees' Meeting Minutes, Jan. 18, 1972).

While the Board exhibited little concern about faculty professional development, it was concerned with the faculty evaluation procedure. It believed the procedure to be so ineffective that it temporarily suspended tenure and promotions for faculty pending the receipt of a new evaluation plan (College Archives, Board of Trustees' Meeting Minutes, Oct. 16, 1973, p. 10). The suspension of tenure and promotion ignited a blistering response from the College Senate President, who questioned, "What was wrong with the old policy? What does the Board specifically want? Will promotions be retroactive?" (College Archives, Board of Trustees' Meeting Minutes, Oct. 16, 1973, p. 10). He concluded by saying "This seems to come up every year. You have yet to convince me that a union is not needed" (p. 10). The Board finally approved a revised Faculty Professional Growth and Development Plan, which included a professional development requirement, but the Board made no provision for the College to provide it (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Sept. 24, 1974).

The Board apparently recognized the need for faculty professional development but was slow to approve a Sabbatical Leave policy for College faculty, and eventually eliminated it. The Board tabled a proposed Sabbatical Leave policy at its May 11, 1970 meeting, then approved a more restrictive version two weeks later and immediately granted a sabbatical leave to a qualified faculty member (College Archives, Trustee Topics, May 25, 1970, p. 1). It revised the Sabbatical Leave policy in 1972 (College Archives, Trustee Topics, May 8, 1972) and granted nine sabbatical leaves (College Archives, Trustee Topics, June 20, 1972, p. 2). The Board approved $80,000 to cover Sabbatical Leaves for the FY73 budget, and then, as part of a cost-cutting measure, discontinued funding for sabbatical leaves after FY73.

Other professional development opportunities were lost when, in addition to sabbatical leave, the Board acceded to the sixth President's request to eliminate Education Progress Research Grants and Innovative Travel as cost-cutting measures. FY73 was the last year that funds for Innovative Funds and Sabbatical Leaves were included in the College budget.

With the Board's approval, President #6 substituted Staff Development Leaves for Innovative Funds and Sabbatical Leaves. The Board approved administrative guidelines for Staff Development and $20,297 to fund it (College Archives, Trustee Topics, Oct. 22, 1974). However, by 1986 Staff Development Leave no longer appeared as a budget item.

In 1989 the Board approved the Banked Leave Program. Under this program an eligible faculty member could earn a semester of paid leave by "banking" or deferring the pay for 15 credits worth of teaching (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 15(1), Sept. 25, 1989, p. 2). Ostensibly the only expense to the College was the price of a substitute teacher for the semester in which the faculty member chose "to spend his or her banked leave" by not working for the semester and drawing full pay.

Even with the relatively inexpensive Banked Leave Program, the College struggled financially during the early 1990s. The State reduced direct aid and in FY92 it also cut its contribution to community college FICA and retirement systems by 25 percent. To help meet the funding crisis, the Board eliminated conference travel funds (College Archives, Annual Report FY72, p. 3).

Summary: Board of Trustees' Perspective

The Board of Trustees, as an outside body, received most of its information about the College through the President and other administrators. The Board hired the President and generally supported his requests. The Board depended on the President and his administrative staff to keep it adequately informed about the condition and needs of the College. Unless the President raised faculty professional development as a policy or budget issue, the Board had no reason to think about it.

Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

The Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (Middle States) is an independent organization with that examines colleges and high schools to determine whether or not they satisfy the requirements to be accredited institutions. Middle States defines accreditation as:

> Accreditation is the means of self-regulation and peer review adopted by the educational community . . . . Middle States accreditation is an expression of confidence in an institution's mission and goals, its performance, and its resources. (Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 1994, p. 1)

Accreditation facilitates the transfer of course credits from one institution to another.

Being accredited by the Middle States was a goal of President # 1 from the day the College opened. As early as 1960 when the Executive Secretary of the Middle

States Association visited the College with a group of other officials, President #1 wanted the Secretary to see the College "as an institution that is progressing rapidly toward full accreditation" (College Archives, Dean's Bulletin No. 4, Oct. 21, 1960).

The Middle States Executive Secretary was pleased with the progress of the College, but he

> cautioned [the Dean] and the faculty and staff not to rush to accreditation. He urged the College to make a self-study first; to list its aims and objectives; to increase the number of books in the library; to hire more full time faculty; to graduate more students and to keep more information on them and their progress and success elsewhere before even thinking of accreditation (College Archives, Badger, 1986, pp. 28-29).

He made no mention of the need for faculty professional development.

The College took his advice and began doing a self-study. In the College's self-evaluation report, rather than professional development, the report discussed "Professional Awareness" (College Archives, Self Evaluation Report, 1963, p. 21) which consisted of detailing the number of memberships in professional organizations, the number of faculty who attended meetings, the number of faculty who published articles, and the number of faculty doing research. A section on "Faculty Travel" (p. 21) was included in the report that explained "Faculty members are permitted to attend professional meetings if they are in the best interest of the individual and the College" (p. 21). Part of the report described the duties and responsibilities of faculty members. Professional development was not included in the description (p. 24), but it was included in another part of the report that discussed how the administration assisted in the improvement of teaching: "The administration encourages faculty members to participate in local, state, regional, and national meetings in their fields and in junior college education" (p. 27). The report included information about the faculty fall orientation, explaining that "this program is designed to acquaint the new faculty member with the philosophy of junior colleges in America, the philosophy of this institution, and the College's operational procedure," (p. 28).

In 1963, after almost two years of self-study and improvement, the College requested Middle States to do an unofficial evaluation (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 49). The visiting Middle States Evaluation Team generally approved of the College's progress, but the team made several observations some of which included faculty professional development. In the 1963 April 29 to May 2, Unofficial Middle States Association Visiting Team Report, the team specifically noted:

- The faculty recognized its need to develop an understanding of its purposes and responsibilities, and for continuous growth in scholarship and professional competence.
- The faculty's "wholesome concern to preserve 'individual differences' and 'academic freedom' [would] avoid conformity to any single way of doing things'" (p. 5).
- The faculty's "seeking of high standards includes the acceptance of the continuing need for self-evaluation and improvement" (p. 5).

- The College's necessity "to develop its faculty organization so that greater academic, educational and intellectual leadership is forthcoming" (p. 5).
- The College's need for provision to be made "for a larger amount of group discussion and collective exchange of a scholarly variety to develop institutional and departmental philosophy. Faculty decisions and actions should be based on scheduled conferences, meetings, committee reports, etc." (p. 6).
- The College's need for a "thorough-going analysis and determination of the objectives of the institution . . . considered by the entire faculty" (p. 6).

One of the critical comments of the unofficial team was to urge "the Board of Trustees to 'recognize the Community College as contemplated in the law – an institution of higher education – not just another unit in the common school system,'" further advising that "'staffing ratios and salary schedules . . . should be geared to higher education expectations and not to the scale of secondary institutions'" (College Archives, Badger, 1986, p. 51).

The unofficial Middle States Visiting Team concluded that "the College would be prepared for an official visit by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as early as the winter of 1966" (College Archives, Unofficial Middle States Association Visiting Team Report, April 29 to May 2, 1963, p. 21).

The College missed the unofficial visiting team's timetable by two years: it filed its self-evaluation report with Middle States in October 1968. The report consisted of the College's answers to Middle States' questions, some of which were related to professional development:

- Question 60. How does the institution encourage and help faculty members to continue their professional growth?

  > The College provides limited funds for attendance at professional meetings. In scheduling, efforts are made to make it possible for faculty members to attend graduate courses in the six nearby universities. During the 1967-68 session, a six-week seminar, meeting once a week, was held for new faculty. Many senior members also attended. Furthermore, as soon as a faculty member completes the required number of course credits for additional increments to salary, the increased remuneration is granted immediately. (College Archives, Self-Evaluation Report, 1968, p. 69A)

- Question 65. How would you describe the duties and responsibilities of a member of your faculty? On which of them do you place the greatest emphasis?

  The answer to this question was a list of 14 items that ranged from "be properly prepared to conduct assigned classes and laboratories, in accordance with approved course goals" to "attend commencement exercises" (College Archives, Self-Evaluation Report, 1968, p. 71). None of the items included professional development.

- Question 68 was directed to the administration's role in professional development of faculty. "How do you emphasize and encourage good teaching and help faculty members evaluate and improve their teaching?"

The College responded:

> Faculty members who teach in the same subject are encouraged to meet together to discuss, evaluate and experiment . . . . New faculty members can discuss areas of teaching and teaching problems with their chairman at any time. Administrative staff, such as the dean of Academic Affairs, are available to all faculty. (College Archives, Self-Evaluation Report, 1968, p. 72).

No mention was made of a faculty professional development plan.

The Middle States Evaluation Team officially visited the College and in February 1969, and wrote a report on its findings. The report called for "immediate attention [to be] . . . given to the formulation of a comprehensive Educational Plan that will govern the future development of the institution. Comprehensive master planning is essential to meet the needs of this growing college" (College Archives, Evaluation Report of [the College], February 16-19, 1969, p. 4).

The report recommended that "faculty individually and through the Faculty Senate . . . take a more active part in making budgetary recommendations to the administration" (p. 9). The visiting team expressed concern "about a salary schedule which is identical to the secondary system . . . ." and that the "faculty structure does not lend itself to a cooperative effort between administration and faculty in planning and development of the institution," (p. 10).

The Visiting Team's report included a number of comments about professional development needs in the report:

- Sabbatical leave policy should follow general higher education policy of leave after six years with full pay for half and half pay for full year [instead of a sabbatical after seven years and half pay].
- Faculty should be encouraged by the dean of Academic Affairs to experiment with new teaching techniques.
- [College has a] need for more positive and consistent procedure for evaluation and improvement of instruction.
- Orientation of inexperienced faculty to the college could be improved.
- [College has a need] to acquaint the faculty with the possibilities of computer use in their areas, consideration should be given to offering a faculty seminar in computer fundamentals. (College Archives, Evaluation Report of [the College], February 16-19, 1969, pp. 6-11)

The Team criticized the "multiple job regulations permitting an individual to be employed outside of the College for twenty hours" (College Archives, Evaluation Report, Oct. 1968). It said that such outside employment was a holdover from the days when school teachers could work outside the school "in an effort to keep the salary scale low," adding that "A look has to be taken at the salary structure within the institution so that job relations will preclude involvement outside the College"

(College Archives, President's Memorandum, Feb. 24, 1969, p. 2). In this instance the visiting team misunderstood the reason for the regulation: the College had encouraged faculty to work at other colleges as a means of raising its own image.

The Team called the faculty organization an area of "major concern" (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Feb. 24, 1969, p. 1):

> There seems to be within the institution a confusion which precludes the necessary close cooperation and communication between the faculty and administration. There is a great need for the faculty to take a look at the development of the faculty senate which tends to reinforce the division of the college rather than reinforce the need for the faculty and administration to work together. This can be accomplished in many different ways . . . . [including]involvement of the administration as members of the faculty. The definition of the faculty as one in which all those who hold academic rank are automatically faculty members. (pp. 1-2)

The visit of the Evaluation Team took place at about the same time as the Board of Education, a.k.a. Board of Trustees, turned the governance of the College over to an appointed Board of Trustees whose single purpose was to govern the College. The Visiting Evaluation Team remarked:

> This step can really become a new beginning for this institution. [It is a] group of trustees without pre-conceived notions and receptive to the kinds of efforts the administration and the faculty should be carrying on together. This is a wonderful chance for the faculty and administration to work together

> educating the Board of Trustees to their responsibilities in higher education. (College Archives, President's Memorandum, Feb. 24, 1969, p. 3)

In his concluding comments, the Chairman of the Middle States Evaluation Committee complimented the faculty and administration by saying, "You have a good college here. You have problems but I have never visited institutions that did not have problems. They seem more serious to you because you are here" (College Archives, President #4 Memorandum, Feb. 24, 1969, p. 4). The Middle States Evaluation Chair said nothing about the professional development concerns that the faculty raised in the College report to the Middle States, even though he addressed almost all of the items that the College faculty had included in its self-study report. The Visiting Team recommended the College for accreditation, which the College received in 1969.

The next Middle States visit was in 1975. The College once again prepared a self-study report prior to the visit. For this report the College focused on career and technical education programs, continuing education and outreach, learning systems, and student development programs. Reference to the Professional Development Committee of the College Senate was made in the Learning Systems chapter of the report.

The 1975 report included the College's short- and long-term institutional goals and objectives. None of them mentioned faculty professional development even though the College recognized the need to stay current "as the role and mission of the College evolves while keeping abreast of the educational and ever changing needs of [the] County" (College Archives, Self-Study Report, 1975, pp. 7-8). The Evaluation

Team did not discuss faculty professional development: they were satisfied with the College's development. The College's accreditation was re-affirmed on June 26, 1975.

The 1975 Visiting Evaluation Team's report is not in the College archives. However, the College's response to the report provides some insight into what the Team had to say. The College's response is in its June 1980 Periodic Review Report (PRR). Middle States Association requires a college to write the PRR five years after the Evaluation Team's visit as part of the procedure for reaffirmation of accreditation. The purpose of the report is to discuss the progress the College has made vis-à-vis the suggestions and recommendations made in the Visiting Evaluation Team's report. Because faculty professional development was not discussed in the PRR (College Archives, 1980), a reasonable conclusion is that it was not a topic in the Visiting Evaluation Team's report.

The PRR (College Archives, 1980) discussed items that potentially had professional development implications such as the faculty evaluation plan, and the addition of telecredit courses, as well as a plan to study the feasibility of using cable television to deliver instruction. Of these items, the 1975 Middle States Association Visiting Team apparently was concerned about the Faculty Evaluation Plan. They thought it was cumbersome. The College reviewed it and made a few changes, explaining:

> The basic elements of the plan remain consistent with the intent, even though filling out the necessary forms is time consuming. The plan was challenged in

> federal court and was found to be inclusive and consistent. Therefore, the college does not wish to remove or modify any of the basic elements which the federal court has found to be satisfactory. (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1980, p. 25)

The College's initiation of telecredit courses in fall 1976 was categorized in the PRR as one of the "major changes since 1975 report" (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1980, p.35). The College explained that the telecredit courses covered the same material as an on-campus course and provided "a flexible learning process" (p. 35). The College apparently believed that faculty did not need any training to teach a telecredit course because none was mentioned.

Under the category of "Programmatic Strategies" the College reported its plan to "carry out a feasibility study to determine the potential for using cable television as a vehicle for large scale delivery of instruction without facilities" (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1980, p. 49). The operative words are "delivery of instruction without facilities." The primary reason the College planned to investigate the use of cable television was its lack of seat space: "Using resources until facilities become available in the late 1980's [sic], this strategy, along with that of continued use of off-campus locations, will be crucial to the continued vitality of [the College]" (pp. 49-50).

In keeping with the Middle States required decennial visit, the College prepared for a visit from an Evaluation Team in 1985. The prelude to the visit was another self-study that was started in fall 1983 with the appointment of a Steering

Committee. The Steering Committee selected "nine areas of concern" for comprehensive study: mission, goals, objectives and outcomes, organization, administration and governance, planning, budgeting and accounting, equipment and physical plant, programs and curricula, maintaining academic standards in a changing environment, learning support services, faculty and teaching, and student affairs (College Archives, Self-Study Report, March 3-6, 1985, p. vii.). A Study Group was assigned to each of the nine areas. The findings and recommendations of the groups are contained in the 1985 Self-Study Report.

Though faculty professional development was not included as a study topic, it appeared in the Self-Study Report under the category "faculty and teaching." The faculty and teaching study group considered faculty professional involvement as a means of projecting "the image of a professionally respectable, community-conscious institution" (College Archives, Self-Study Report, March 3-6, 1985, p. 121). The Study Group recommended that "recruiting efforts and media publicity stress the areas of achievement of Board of Trustees, faculty and students" (p. vii, p. 122).

The Study Group raised concerns about professional development as it applied to the Faculty Growth and Development Plan. The particular concern was about the number of points given for professional development activities. The Study Group pointed out that one day spent at a conference yielded "only one point less than a full semester spent enrolled in a three-credit course" (College Archives, Self-Study Report, March 3-6, 1985, p. 130). The Study Group recognized that "with some revision, [the professional development] form could be used to properly reward demanding professional activities such as publishing, successfully completing graduate courses, etc." (p. 130). Almost parenthetically, the Study Group reported that "The Fall Orientation discussion of this report produced a suggestion to set up an informal, parallel developmental system independent of the evaluation to help faculty improve" (p. vii, p. 131).

Under "Opportunities for Innovation and Experimentation" (College Archives, Self-Study Report, March 3-6 1985, pp. 138-141) the Study Group made several recommendations concerning the College programs in which faculty could receive release time to work on projects. The recommendations included expanding the programs as the budget allowed, clarifying release time criteria, standardizing the chain of command for approving leave requests, and publicizing the results of projects (p. 141).

The Study Group recommended three professional release programs for expansion. One was the Staff Development Leave program initiated in 1976 and granted to a total of 17 faculty members (College Archives, Self-Study Report, March 3-6, 1985, p. 139). Another program, the Administration Assistant Program started in 1980, enabled "a faculty member to work on an administrative assignment for one or two semesters . . . without change of status and without losing time in rank" (p. vii, p. 139). Only three faculty members had participated. The third and most common program was the Alternative Instruction Program (AIP) which was begun in 1975 to offer faculty release time "from the normal teaching load or extended time (overloads) for instructional projects during the regular semester or in the summer"

(p. 139). The Study Group praised the programs and believed that they should be "a more vital component of this faculty's professional life" (p. 140).

The Study Group made several recommendations about professional development in relation to "the serious issues raised by the concerns of faculty morale" (College Archives, Self-Study Report, March 3-6, 1985, p. 147). The group explained that 51% of the faculty had taught at the College for at least 15 years, that in many departments there was little opportunity for diversity, that many faculty received little or no variety in courses to teach, and that all faculty had to deal with a poorly prepared and poorly motivated student body. The solution, according to the Study Group, was for faculty to be rewarded "for continued professional development and for service and scholarship" (p. 146). The Study Group also recommended that the College:

> encourage the Office of Institutional Research to increase its efforts to assist faculty members who wish to evaluate current and alternative modes of instruction . . . . [G]ive visible recognition to professional achievement in all academic and technical areas . . . . [O]rganize and subsidize only orientation programs and projects for which there is a clear and demonstrated need and for which there is adequate money to implement the good ideas the may come from such programs. (p. vii, pp. 147-148)

The 1985 Study Group recognized professional development as a means to invigorate a senior, aging faculty; as a means through which faculty should receive special recognition from the College; and as an avenue for the College to receive positive publicity.

By 1990, when the College prepared its Periodic Review Report for the Middle States Association, the significance and purpose of professional development had changed significantly: "In January of 1990 the President officially declared the 1990s as the Decade of Professional Development" (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, p. 4). Existing faculty and staff development programs were expanded and new programs were added. "A wide variety of across-the-curriculum projects (writing, communication, honors, women's scholarship, critical thinking, computing) . . . involved hundreds of faculty in instructional development" (p. 4). Funding was increased for conference travel, tuition reimbursement, on- and off-campus workshops, release-time projects, and awards programs to better serve the professional development needs of faculty and staff (p. 4). A new multifaceted Faculty Mentor program was "created and administered by outstanding senior faculty" (p. 46) to improve classroom instruction through workshops and peer mentoring. Additionally, Professional Development Week with expanded programs and workshops during the semester were "meeting organizational, personal, professional, and instructional development needs on an ongoing basis" (p. 46).

For the first time in the history of the College, professional development was identified as a strategic priority in the Master Plan. The President's declaration supported the College's 1991-95 strategic priority to "create a campuswide Professional Development Plan to enhance the skills, attitude, knowledge, and performance of College employees as a means of achieving the College mission" (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, p. 12).

The logic for making professional development a priority was based on the county's demographic projections that suggested the College was unlikely to experience any large enrollment increases. Along with limited enrollment increases, the College anticipated few curriculum changes, and limited numbers of new faculty (p. 45). In response to the bleak scenario, the President and the Board of Trustees made "a commitment to faculty and staff development as an institutional priority" (p. 45) and "to maintain a highly skilled, productive, versatile, and effective staff" (p. 45).

The human resources strategic priority was stated as a broadly encompassing goal with four objectives related to professional development:

> GOAL: Create a campuswide Professional Development Plan in which programs are developed to enhance the skills, attitudes, knowledge, and performance of College employees as a means of achieving the College mission.
>
> Objectives:
>
> 1. Establish organizational development programs designed to strengthen and improve general employee efficiency and effectiveness.
> 2. Establish human resource development programs designed to assist and support College employees with career and life planning goals.

3. Establish professional development programs designed to update and enhance professional skills and knowledge in academic disciplines and educational administration.
4. Establish instructional development programs designed to strengthen and improve teaching effectiveness for full-time and part-time faculty. (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, pp.45-46)

The 1990 PRR responded to a 1985 complaint about the need to improve communications between faculty and administration, saying that communications had improved since the 1985 reorganization of the administrative structure. The creation of a "single instructional dean responsible for academic leadership" (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, p. 47) and the appointment of two senior faculty members to Area Coordinator positions were credited with improving communications. The Coordinators created "a new channel for faculty communication with the administration about academic programs that crossed divisions, as well as an administrative home for faculty development programs" (p. 47). Communications were further improved with the publication of the Instructional Forum, an instructional area newsletter. The first issue was published in 1985 and continued with six issues per year.

The Faculty Professional Growth and Development Plan (the PLAN) was revised significantly in 1986. Senior faculty not applying for promotion or tenure could use a short form of the PLAN, while new faculty or those seeking promotion or tenure use a revised version. The PRR noted that “only the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees control the PLAN’s content” (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, p. 47).

The Faculty Development section of the PRR ends with the following declaration:

> The inclusion of professional development as a strategic priority in the College’s “Master Plan” has signaled a commitment to faculty renewal and development . . . . The recognition that professional development is the key to ensuring that the faculty be retained and renewed ensures the maintenance and support of those faculty qualities described in the 1985 visiting team report: competence, quality, commitment, and concern. (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 1990, p.48)

The report that the College received from the 1995 Middle States Visiting Team did not comment on the College’s commitment to professional development. The Team’s only reference to professional development was a suggestion that “The Deans Council should ask each department to submit a plan for the continuing development of part-time faculty” (College Archives, Visiting Team Report, 1995, p. 20). The College explained that since 1995, professional development opportunities had been provided for part-time faculty by the Vice President for Instruction, the department chairmen, and the division deans (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 2000, p. 54).

Even though issues about faculty professional development had been raised at the College from time to time, they appeared to be of little interest to Middle States. The Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs said that faculty professional development had never been a topic of interest to the Middle States Association in either of the accrediting renewal evaluations (1985 and 1995) in which she participated (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1998).

The 2000 PRR described the College's effort to make professional development more visible and accessible:

> In 1998 the Teaching and Learning Center was established to support an extensive professional development plan developed for faculty by the Professional Development Team. A Professional Development Council was also established to coordinate the professional development activities of staff and faculty. The newly appointed [D]irector of Staff and Faculty Professional Development runs the Teaching and Learning Center and chairs the Professional Development Council. The goal is to develop one comprehensive professional development program that meets the needs of all college employees. (College Archives, pp. 69-70)

Summary: Perspective of Commission on Higher Education Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools

The College has been reporting officially to Middle States since 1967. As the accrediting organization, Middle States can and has significantly influenced the activities of the College as illustrated by the College's responses to the Visiting Team's comments, suggestions and recommendations. If Middle States had demanded more emphasis on faculty professional development, the College would have complied. No matter how important the faculty and administration believe faculty professional development is, the College must put its resources wherever the accrediting organization places the emphasis. To date the Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools has not emphasized faculty professional development.

Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), and Maryland Association of Community Colleges (MACC)

Community colleges in Maryland operated under the authority of local boards of education until 1968 when the State became more directly involved with community college governance:

> In 1961 the [Maryland State] General Assembly authorized the State Superintendent of Schools to approve formally the establishment of Community Colleges by local boards of education and to permit these boards to be constituted as boards of trustees of their respective Community Colleges . . . . In 1968 the General Assembly provided for the optional establishment of separate boards of trustees . . . [and] . . . created a State Board for Community Colleges as a coordinating agency. (Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1973, p. 3).

The legislation that created the State Board for Community Colleges gave it broad authority over community colleges. Among other powers, it had the authority to establish general policies for the operation of the State's Community Colleges, conduct studies on the problems of community college education, and "review and advise . . . for proposed major additions to or modifications of programs" (Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1973, p. 110).

The State Board for Community Colleges developed a Statewide Master Plan for Community Colleges in Maryland 1973-1983. The purpose of the Master Plan was "to define the Community College role within Maryland's tripartite structure of higher education, to establish priorities and to recommend policies" (Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1973, p. 5).

The State Board was aware of the need for faculty professional development and funding for it. The Plan addressed both points, specifying that a community college instructor needed to be prepared "to meet the instructional demands of a rapidly changing student population" (Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1973, p. 28). The Plan also specified that in addition to knowing "a particular branch of learning" (p. 28) the instructor needed to know different learning strategies and "modern devices for implementing them" (p. 28).

For the faculty already employed by the community college to acquire the recommended skills and abilities, the Plan recommended "ongoing in-service training programs" (Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1973, p. 28). The Plan became even more specific:

> Since faculty must keep abreast of current developments in their respective major fields, each college should allocate funds in its operating budget to be used to support staff development training programs. In addition, the State Board for Community Colleges should provide funds to sponsor Statewide meetings and workshops oriented toward the improvement of instructional delivery systems. (Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, 1973, p. 29).

Further, the Plan encouraged university graduate schools to establish specific programs for community college faculty and administrators who sought advanced education.

In 1986, the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges published the report of the committee that it had appointed to study the future of Maryland Community Colleges. Community colleges were faced with a radically different set of operating conditions than they experienced over the preceding 20 years. Instead of "tremendous growth and expansion" (Committee on the Future of Maryland Community Colleges, 1986, p. vii) they were facing "enrollment declines, budget restraints, and severe competition for students and funding" (p. vii).

The Committee on the Future concluded that community colleges needed to shift their "emphasis from managing rapid growth to maintaining and improving quality" (Committee on the Future of Maryland Community Colleges, 1986, p. vii). The committee called for all community college stakeholders–trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and students–to create a climate of excellence. The committee encouraged the faculty of community colleges to "continually strive to keep current in their disciplines and keep alive their commitment to student success" (p. vii).

The committee believed that "burnout" among faculty who had been teaching the same thing year after year with little variation would be a major inhibitor of quality instruction at a community college:

> Quality instruction is a principle ingredient of a successful community college. Excellent teaching requires vibrant teachers who are enthusiastic about their profession and well informed in their discipline. An enemy of excellence in instruction is "burnout". . . . Burnout has been traced to the "essential sameness" of community college teaching. (Committee on the Future of Maryland Community Colleges, 1986, p. 44)

The "burnout" prevention, according to the committee, was faculty development programs. The committee accepted the broad view of faculty development:

> The definition of faculty development varies widely as do faculty development programs. Faculty development programs range from in-service teaching workshops to counseling in career changes to early retirement incentives. Some faculty development programs may extend over several semesters while others may last only hours. Some faculty development programs are part of a well designed institutional plan while others are

> isolated and disparate offerings. (Committee on the Future of Maryland Community Colleges, 1986, p. 45)

The committee concluded, "In the future, faculty development will be critical to the continued excellence of community college education" (Committee on the Future of Maryland Community Colleges, 1986, p. 45). The committee singled out community college faculty as those most in need of professional development:

> Many community college faculty, especially in the more traditional transfer programs where many teachers were hired in the late 1960s and the 1970s, have been at their teaching posts for more than a decade and a half, with few opportunities for continuing scholarship in their disciplines. Thus, there is a special need for professional development, which encourages faculty to keep abreast of their academic discipline through study, research, consultation, conferences, and other traditional avenues of intellectual renewal . . . . The benefits of such scholarly endeavors are passed on directly to students in the form of revitalized teaching, but they can also be shared with the entire academic community . . . thus enriching the intellectual environment of the community college campus. (p. 45)

Therefore, the committee recommended that:

> community colleges develop and implement a long-range plan for faculty development. In addition, community colleges should support programs for faculty development through sabbaticals, released time for scholarly

endeavors, funding support for conferences, and other appropriate means. (p. 45)

The State Board for Community Colleges barely had distributed their Blueprint for Quality future report when the State Legislature reorganized Maryland's post-secondary system. As a result of the reorganization, in 1988 the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) succeeded the State Board for Higher Education and the State Scholarship Board (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland: Education, 1989, pp. 243-244). As far as the State Board for Community Colleges was concerned the reorganization simply meant that it would coordinate with one Commission instead of two Boards. However, shortly after the reorganization, in a sudden move, Governor William Donald Schaefer dissolved the State Board for Community Colleges.

State governance for community colleges was shifted to MHEC. Among other duties, MHEC develops statewide plans for higher education, coordinates the State's program of performance accountability reporting for public institutions of higher education, and grants final approval of mission statements for each public institution of higher education (Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland: Education, 1989, p. 251). The broad scope of MHEC duties–involving all institutions of higher education in Maryland–leaves little time for it to give voice to the specific needs and interests of community colleges. The community colleges, then, lost their voice and an advocate at the state level with the demise of the State Board for Community Colleges.

In 1992 Maryland's 16 community colleges regained their voice at state level when they formed the Maryland Association of Community Colleges (MACC). The purpose of MACC is "to achieve the collective legislative and other statewide goals of its members and to advocate the benefits of community college services for the citizens of the State of Maryland" (Maryland Associations of Community Colleges, 2000). MACC includes professional development in its "Statement of Mission," which it sees as conducting "in-service programs which enhance the professional skills of trustees and administrators" (Maryland Association of Community Colleges, 2000). MACC does not address the professional development needs of community college faculty.

Summary: Perspectives of Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Maryland Higher Education Commission, and Maryland Association of Community Colleges

The professional development needs and issues raised in 1973 and 1986 by the Maryland Board for Community Colleges still exist, but they appear to no longer be of concern at the state level. MHEC is concerned that the mission statements of individual institutions be consistent with the State's plan for higher education. MACC is concerned with maintaining a positive relationship with MHEC and the state legislature. Individual community colleges in the State of Maryland, then, are left to do as they will with faculty professional development.

Technology Perspective

One area in which professional development has been consistently offered at the College is in the use of technology. In early days of the College, audio-visual equipment was new technology. At a September 24, 1960 faculty meeting the librarian announced "We now have a tape recorder, phonograph, slide projector, film strip projector, and portable screen" (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, p. 2). Soon the College was buying more equipment. At the March 25, 1961 Faculty Meeting "It was announced that we will be purchasing a new projector, phonograph, and slide projector for next semester" (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, p.3).

Two years after the College began acquiring audio-visual aids, the concern was raised at a divisional chairmen's meeting "that there is a tremendous field in this area and that it was not being adequately appreciated and used because the instructors were not aware of how it could be used" (Divisional chairmen meeting minutes, Oct. 15, 1963, p.3). The suggested solution was to invite a University of Maryland "authority on the use of audio-visual aids . . . to demonstrate to the faculty the possibilities and usefulness of these aids in the classroom" (p.3). The Divisional Chairmen agreed, but the faculty had to be convinced. At the next faculty meeting:

> There was a general discussion . . . about library supplies, especially the use of the overhead projector. [The librarian] stated she had been in contact with . . . [the] professor and head of Industrial Education at the University of Maryland, who would be willing to meet with faculty to demonstrate audio-

> visual machines if this was agreeable with faculty. It was agreed this should be done. (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Oct. 26, 1963, p. 7)

After audio-visual aids came data processing equipment. At a faculty meeting in 1964 the faculty was introduced to a representative of IBM. The representative

> explained the uses and advantages of IBM data processing. A series of IBM cards had been distributed to the faculty members earlier and the remainder of the meeting was used to instruct the faculty as to the use of these cards at registration. The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. with the announcement that the IBM machine room was open for inspection for anyone who cared to come. (College Archives, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Jan. 18, 1964, p. 4)

Computers were first used for record keeping and administration: "The System and Computer Technology Corporation and the college have signed a contract for a computerized registration system" (College Archives, Divisional Chairmen meeting minutes, Mar. 30, 1971). Next, computers were introduced for classroom use. One of the institutional operational objectives for FY86 was to "Encourage the incorporation of computer literacy into appropriate courses throughout the college" (College Archives, Evidence of Achievement of Institutional Operational Objectives, FY86, p. 7). Evidence that the objective was being met was that "Individual divisions are training their staffs to use the computer to enhance their efficiency" (p. 7).

Interactive television (ITV) via cable was introduced at the College in the late 1980s. The technology was so new that in 1992, at the end for the first semester in which a management course was taught at two locations simultaneously, students at both sites received certificates as Charter Members of the first ITV MGT 101 course. Cable ITV was replaced in the mid-90s by the closed circuit Bell Atlantic classroom.

In 1981 in-service training was offered to faculty on how to use the new telephone system (College Archives, Faculty Senate Memo, 8(7), Nov. 20, 1981, p.2). The system had a new feature, voice mail, and faculty had to learn the College's protocol for voice-mail messages.

By 1998, faculty was impatient with the slow rate of computer technology development at the College, and wanted to know the status of the College's computer infrastructure. The College's Teaching and Learning Center responded by sponsoring an information session presented by the Chief of Information Systems and the Information Systems' Director of Network Service (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 2000, p. 52).

> Progress was advanced substantially in FY99 when the College invested $2,275,723 to upgrade the college's administrative and academic infrastructure with the purchase of computers, computer networks for instructional laboratories, a new fiber-optic backbone, upgraded file servers, and extensive upgrading of computer hardware, software, and training for faculty. (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 2000, p. 56)

Beginning in 1998 the College provided technology workshops for faculty and staff. The workshops were conducted to teach faculty how to use software such as Microsoft® Word® and Corel® WordPerfect® for word processing, Microsoft® Excel® for spreadsheets, and Microsoft® PowerPoint® for presentations. In 1999, when the college accessed the Internet, new workshops were offered to teach faculty how to develop Web-based courses, use Novell® GroupWise® communication software, and construct Web sites (College Archives, Periodic Review Report, 2000, p. 57). Training for developing and implementing an online course was added in 2000.

Overhead projectors, which were considered a state-of-the-art method of instructional delivery in 1963, are being replaced by PowerPoint® presentations, interactive classrooms, and online courses. Proper use of the technologies have required that faculty accept them and be trained to use them.

Summary: Technology

Technology training has been the only professional development activity that the College consistently has provided and faculty wanted. To date the College has little evidence that the improved technology has improved faculty's teaching or students' learning. Nevertheless, the adoption of state-of-the-art technology, while sometimes slow, has never been questioned, nor has the need for the professional development that must accompany it.

Chapter Summary

From every perspective, over the College's 41-year history–with the exception of technology–faculty professional development has been uneven and less than satisfactory. It has suffered from a variety of difficulties including:

- indifference from some of the College's presidents,
- limited funding and no budget line in the College's budgets,
- inadequate programs planned by some of the College's administrators,
- combining it with other agendas,
- limited role of faculty in planning,
- little encouragement for faculty members who pursued their own professional development, and
- little interest on the part of outside stakeholders.

When placed in context, each of the difficulties can be explained within the circumstances in which they arose and become reasons why community college faculty professional development has been uneven and less than satisfactory.

Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusions

This study surfaced four significant, but less obvious reasons why a community college offers faculty professional development that previous researchers have not reported. These four newly identified reasons include offering faculty professional development because it is an educational tradition or custom; it is a social occasion; it helps to create or to promote the proper image of the college; and, it is required by outside agencies.

The significance of this finding is that individually and collectively the four reasons substantially contribute to the lack of constancy found in faculty professional development as it has been practiced at a community college. Faculty professional development may be offered for any one of these reasons depending on the particular situation of the community college at the moment. This "reason du jour" approach to faculty professional development only can lead to lack of constancy.

The community college has used the reason du jour approach to faculty professional development for so long that it has become embedded in its culture. A cultural shift abetted by the application of a standard, such as the Malcolm Baldrige criteria for performance excellence, is necessary if a community college wants to eliminate the lack of constancy and to engage its faculty in meaningful, constant professional development. This conclusion would not have been possible without the perspective of time provided by examining 41 years of faculty professional development at a community college. In addition to identifying four previously unreported reasons for offering faculty professional development, this study also supported many of the claims about community colleges that are found in the literature. The similarity of findings suggests that the implications of this study may be generalized to other community colleges.

The next section discusses claims found in the literature that are supported by this study. Following that section is a brief presentation of traditional reasons typically given to explain why community colleges offer faculty professional development. A detailed discussion of the four newly identified reasons for why community colleges offer faculty professional development and how they lead to lack of constancy follows the presentation of traditional reasons. The answers to the three research questions that launched this study follow naturally from the discussion of the four newly identified reasons. Next, the Malcolm Baldrige criteria for performance excellence are described and then collectively used as a standard for assessing faculty professional development as it has been offered by the Community College over the past 41 years. The chapter concludes with suggestions for additional research, and final thoughts for using the Baldrige criteria as a means to change the culture of the Community College so that the College can achieve constancy in its faculty professional development program.

Study Supported Claims in the Literature

After examining each of the perspectives presented by this study, a whole picture of faculty professional development at a community college emerged which supported many of the claims in the literature. These supported claims follow.

- Community colleges always have had faculty professional development. Cohen and Brawer (1996) attested to the continued presence of faculty professional development at community colleges. From its founding the Community College in this study encouraged faculty to develop professionally.
- The availability of professional development programs at community colleges has increased over the decades: from the 1960s when few adequate programs were available (Singer, 1969), to the 1980s and 1990s when community colleges began implementing professional development programs (Shawl, 1984; Harnish, 1986).

  The availability of professional development programs at the Community College in this study matched the national trend. In the 1960s little professional development was available at the College. By the 1980s professional development programs were being implemented, and by the late 1990s, a full-time Teaching and Learning Center for faculty professional development was established.
- Professional development programs at community colleges are subject to change. O'Banion (1981) and Gappa and Leslie (1993) cautioned that a college's professional development program might have changed since they reported it in their respective studies. Gappa and Leslie suggested that the changing of "time, people and programs" (pp. 10-11) were responsible for changes in professional development.

In this study changes in funding and people were the primary causes of change. Each time the president changed, and each time a different administrator was put in charge of professional development, it changed. Budget shortfalls also brought about cuts in funding for professional development activities.

- Administrators influence how a college conducts professional development (Miller & Wilson, 1963). This study demonstrated that each administrator who was in charge of faculty professional development handled it differently.
- Professional development programs that are not anchored in a goal or objective are likely to be haphazard (Soffen, 1967). Institutional goals and objectives were never established for professional development at the Community College in this study and from year to year the programs were uneven in quality and unfocused in purpose.

The consistency with which the Community College in this study reflected the claims found in the literature over the years suggested a high degree of commonality among community colleges in their approach to faculty professional development. Therefore, the extent to which these community colleges have experienced a lack of constancy in their faculty professional development programs may be attributable to the four newly identified reasons.

Traditional Reasons Given for Why Community Colleges Offer Faculty Professional Development

Several motives or purposes for why community colleges offer faculty professional development are found in the literature. This study does not dispute these motives or purposes. The results of this study simply indicate that the traditional reasons are not adequate to explain its lack of constancy. Bergquist and Phillips' (1977/1979) four element model encapsulates the traditional reasons given for why community colleges offer faculty professional development:

- personal development: "a direct attempt to increase the self-awareness of faculty as individuals and as people in relationships with others" (1981, p. 167).
- instructional development: to help faculty become broadly acquainted with a variety of teaching methods (1981, p.71).
- organizational development: "an attempt to help . . . organizations function more effectively and humanely" (1981, p.182).
- community development: "concern with the entire environment of an institution" (1977/1979, p. 6).

Three of the purposes–personal, instruction, and organizational–were demonstrated at one time or another at the College, but the results of this study indicate that faculty professional development was offered for other reasons as well.

Other Reasons Why Community Colleges Offer Faculty Professional Development

This study found that, in addition to the traditional reasons for a community college to offer faculty professional development, four other less obvious reasons exist that previously have been unreported. The four reasons, listed below, are followed by a discussion of each.

A community college offers faculty professional development because:

- Faculty professional development is an educational tradition or custom
- Faculty professional development is a social occasion
- Faculty professional development helps to create or to promote the proper image of the college
- Faculty professional development meets the requirements of outside agencies such as policy-making bodies, accrediting agencies, and government offices.

Faculty Professional Development is an Educational Tradition or Custom

Realizing that the College was offering professional development, in part, to satisfy an educational tradition established by both kindergarten–grade 12 schools and four-year institutions, helps explain why the programs have been so uneven. This reason explains why the Coordinator of Staff Development and Cross Cultural Education thought a random assortment of staff and faculty "willing to present workshops" was sufficient "to create a staff development program" (see p. 239), and why, particularly in the early days of the College, administrators felt obliged "to do something" (see p. 193).

When the College treated professional development like a tradition, it had difficulty determining when it should be and how many days it should last. Some at the College wanted in-service days during the school year in the tradition of the public school system. Others wanted it at the beginning of the school year. No matter what schedule was used, some faculty were not aware that the College had "any formal professional development program" (see pp. 209-210).

If a community college offers faculty professional development programs because it feels obliged to conform to the educational tradition, the program suffers because faculty professional development does not become part of the college's culture (Hoerner et al., 1991). Offering faculty professional development because it is considered an obligatory educational tradition serves neither the mission of the community college nor its faculty. Remnants of faculty professional development as an educational tradition may still exist, but in recent years, the Community College in this study has begun to move beyond this traditional approach.

Faculty Professional Development is a Social Occasion

From the earliest days of the College, faculty professional development was often treated like a social event. The first president held Saturday faculty meetings to talk philosophy, standards, etc. These were mini-professional development sessions, but the first president thought of the faculty as "a little family." To him the meetings were a means of trying "to keep up with everything and with each other" (President #1, see p. 142). Twenty years after the College was founded, professional development was conducted occasionally at a staff member's swimming pool: it was clearly a social event.

Forty years after the College was founded, faculty professional development continued to be viewed as a social opportunity. One consistent response in the focus group results (Focus Group Results Memo, August 5, 1998) was the desire of all faculty, full- and part-time, to have more time to spend together. Each of the 1998 faculty focus groups wanted more collegiality. Senior faculty in the focus groups wanted retreats "as opportunities to reconnect with faculty across campus and share ideas" (see p. 246). Adjunct and new full-time faculty wanted to meet and feel connected to other faculty (see pp. 246-247). Even the administrators considered the fall orientation meeting a semi-social event (see pp. 285-286).

The importance of faculty and staff having time to socialize has not been factored into most professional development programs, nor has it been considered a critical element. Nevertheless, the social aspect may contribute to establishing the positive college climate in which faculty professional development can thrive as camaraderie among faculty members increases. However, the social element contributes to the lack of constancy in faculty professional development when administrators and faculty professional development planners consider professional development days as a social time and do not plan substantial, appropriate professional development activities. The social element also contributes to the lack of constancy in professional development when faculty members choose to socialize rather than attend programmed professional development activities. Taken together the combination leads to lack of constancy in professional development programs, and diminishes the potential for faculty professional development.

Faculty Professional Development Helps to Create or to Promote an Image

When the first president was trying to establish acceptance for the College as an institution of higher education, he used faculty professional development as one means to do so. He encouraged his faculty to attend conferences and state meetings of colleges and universities as a means to develop the image of the College as a recognized institution of higher education. Forty years later, the College's administration was still interested in knowing what prestigious events faculty attended, because their attendance enhanced the image of the College.

The sixth president declared the 1990s to be the professional development decade. The declaration included in the June 1990 Periodic Review Report (p. 45), clearly was intended to make a positive impression on the College's accrediting agency. The President's declaration turned out to be more form than substance, nevertheless, at the time, it had the desired effect. It promoted a positive image of the Community College as an institution of higher education that maintained its currency through the professional development of its faculty.

Faculty Professional Development Meets the Requirements of Outside Agencies

The College's Board of Trustees never indicated any particular interest in faculty professional development. The Board of Trustees took its lead from the College's presidents: it approved funding for professional development when a president requested it, and eliminated funding for professional development when a president requested it.

Nevertheless, because the Board of Trustees is the College's policy-making body, the potential for it to influence faculty professional development should not be ignored.

In some states, outside agencies have driven faculty professional development. In Florida and California, state legislatures have mandated that community colleges provide faculty professional development. In Oregon, the state legislature allocated professional development funds to a community college and dictated the specific activity that the college had to fund with the money. To date the Maryland State Legislature has made no such demand, but before the State Board of Community College Education was dissolved, it emphasized the importance of professional development.

The outside agency that has most influenced the College's attention to professional development has been Middle States, its accrediting agency. The College had to conform to what Middle States considered important, and Middle States considered faculty professional development as one of the "characteristics of enlightened faculty policies" (Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 1994, p. 11). Failure to satisfy Middle States could result in loss of accreditation. Without Middle States accreditation, few if any other colleges would give students credit for courses that they took at the College.

Answers to Research Questions

The lack of constancy in community college faculty professional development becomes easier to understand when the four newly identified reasons are considered.

These factors also contribute to answering the three research questions that were the underpinnings for this study.

Research Question 1

What major forces have shaped faculty professional development at the community college over time?

The obvious shapers are a college's administration, faculty, faculty representatives, outside stakeholders, technology, and budget. None of these shaping forces influence faculty professional development unilaterally; they are entwined and interlocked. The shaping role that each has played and the influence that each has exerted affects the culture of the college.

Establishing and maintaining a college culture that supports faculty professional development is difficult because of intervening circumstances that change with time, such as start-up difficulties, financial reversals, changes in administrations, and demands of outside agencies. For faculty professional development to be ingrained in the culture of a college, it must be continuously related to the mission of the college. A random selection of workshops offered to faculty in the name of professional development should not happen if the college has mission-related outcomes in mind for professional development. The institution and the faculty question the value of professional development when it does not fit the purpose of either the faculty or the institution.

Most descriptions of how community colleges overhauled their professional development programs speak to process, not purpose. The old expression "if you don't know where you are going, any road will get you there" could be applied to professional development programs that lack goals and objectives consistent with a college's mission.

Research Question 2

How has a community college planned and implemented professional development over time?

Over the years, the College in this study was haphazard in its approach to planning and implementing professional development activities. The type of professional development programs that were planned and implemented depended on the administrator in charge. Management of professional development at the College changed hands many times: it was passed from senior administers to assistants to coordinators, back to a senior administrator and then to a group. Professional development has consistently been treated like an unwanted requirement.

That professional development has been shifted back and forth among administrators does not mean that the efforts of the various people who produced the programs were not sincere. On the contrary, they worked hard but they worked without institutional guidelines and defined purpose. They had no reason to ask questions such as: Why are we offering this particular workshop? Does it fit into the overall objective that the College is trying to achieve with its professional development program? What are the outcomes we expect from this particular program?

Research Question 3

Through the years, how responsive have professional development plans been to the needs and interests of the faculty?

The Community College in this study has tried to be responsive to the needs and interests of the faculty. At any given point in time, the College would say that it has been responsive; yet aside from technology training, the College has had difficulty responding to the professional development needs of faculty. Evidence of the difficulty is a comparison of the 1987 faculty survey (see pp. 233-237). with the 1998 faculty survey (see 1998 Paper and Pencil Survey, pp. 240-242). In both instances faculty were interested in staying current in their disciplines and improving their teaching skills. If the results of the 1987 survey had been used to development a responsive on-going professional development plan, these same needs should not have reappeared in 1995.

One of the areas in professional development that the College has consistently overlooked is the willingness of some faculty to initiate their own professional development. The most personally meaningful and useful professional development is that which the individual pursues on his or her accord. Sometimes in the effort to promote group professional development activities, personal professional development gets lost or is ignored. If the College is interested in the personal professional development needs of the faculty, then it needs to deliberately support the efforts of individual faculty members.

The efforts that have been made to satisfy faculty professional development needs have been limited by time and money. Contrary to Angelo's (1994) assertion, faculty members have limited time; and, the College either has not or could not provide sufficient funding. However, if faculty professional development were embedded in the culture of the College and tied to the mission of the College, in all likelihood, adequate provision would be made for both time and money, just as it has been for technology training.

Throughout its history the College has offered training to upgrade the faculty's technological skills. Frequently the timing of the training and the need for the training were not synchronized. For example, training to operate the ditto machine was offered two years after the machine was purchased. Training for web site development and Microsoft® PowerPoint® software were offered as much as two years before some faculty received the necessary equipment to put the training to use. And, approximately three years after the first course at the College went online, the College began to train faculty in how to prepare and teach online courses. Even though the timing has not been perfect, technology training is one area in which the College has actively and aggressively tried to satisfy the faculty's needs. In this instance the need of the College to have the faculty be technologically literate coincided with the College's need to have state of the art education delivery systems.

Faculty professional development has been accepted at the Community College as necessary. However, for it to be meaningful and productive, the College culture must provide more focus to professional development. This is unlikely to happen unless faculty professional development has goals and outcomes related to the mission of the community college. Establishing a standard, such as the Malcolm Baldrige criteria for performance excellence, against which the College could measure its faculty professional efforts would be a good starting place.

Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award 1998

Criteria for Performance Excellence

The Malcolm Baldrige national quality award, established in 1987 to recognize businesses for performance excellence, was adapted for education in 1998. For an educational institution to win the prestigious award it must demonstrate excellence in its ability to meet two results-oriented goals:

- "provision of ever-improving educational value to students, contributing to their overall development and well-being; and
- improvement of overall school effectiveness, use of resources, and capabilities" (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 1998, p. 34).

Faculty professional development is included in the Baldrige criteria for performance excellence under the category "Faculty and Staff Focus" (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 1998, p. 13). The purpose of the category, which is number five of seven, is to examine

> how the school enables faculty and staff to develop and utilize their full potential, aligned with the school's objectives. Also examined are the school's efforts to build and maintain an environment and climate conducive to performance excellence, full participation, and personal and organizational growth. (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 1998, p. 13)

If faculty professional development as it has been handled at the Community College over the past 41 years were examined using the Baldrige criteria of excellence, it would fall short for one significant reason: the faculty professional development offered by the Community College has never been aligned with the school's objectives. When the Community College aligns its faculty professional development program with the its mission, the lack of constancy that has plagued faculty professional development over the years can be eliminated.

Recommendations for Additional Research

This study examined faculty professional development offered by the Community College as a whole. Faculty professional development also takes place at the department level of the College. Research into how the departments handle faculty professional development is a study that has yet to be done. Such a study could help collegewide planners of professional development activities augment what the departments provide.

Only individuals who were directly involved with planning and implementing faculty professional development were interviewed for this study. A qualitative study that focuses on obtaining the point-of-view of the faculty recipients of the professional development activities could provide necessary information to tailor professional development programs that meet faculty's specific professional development needs.

Finally, while the similarities among community colleges have been amply demonstrated, nevertheless, the validity of the results of this study could be confirmed if it were replicated at another community college.

Final Thoughts

The importance of faculty professional development is undisputed, yet its lack of constancy at the community college has limited its value. Constancy can be achieved if the community college is willing to align professional development with the college's mission. Such an alignment will not be easy because it requires a cultural shift in thought away from professional development as a process to professional development as a tool to advance the mission of the college by deliberately developing faculty in areas specific to the mission.

The college can use the Malcolm Baldrige criteria for performance excellence to assess the purpose of its faculty professional development and to make adjustments necessary to bring constancy to its faculty professional development programs. If a community college is willing to undertake such an assessment, in addition to constancy it potentially can bring excellence to its faculty professional development program.

APPENDIX

College Archives and Administrators' Files

Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Professional Affiliation Chairman's letter to Senate member. (1973, August 6).

Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization of the College Senate. (1974, September 10). [report.]

"Administration by Objectives in Student Personnel Programs." (undated, c. 1970). [Unpublished article by President #5].

Annual Cost Containment Report. (1993, September 1).

Annual Report FY72.

Annual Report FY93.

Appointments Committee of the College Senate. (c. 1968-69). Memo to the College Community. Priorities of consideration in selecting an academic dean.

Badger, M.L., Jr. (1986). In the beginning was the dream: The history of the founding of . . . Community college 1957-1969. Largo, MD: . . . College.

Board of Trustees' meeting minutes. (1971, July 26).

Board of Trustees' meeting minutes. (1972, January 18).

Board of Trustees' meeting minutes. (1973, June 19).

Board of Trustees' meeting minutes. (1973, August 28).

Board of Trustees' meeting minutes. (1973, October 16).

Chairman, Committee on Faculty Travel, Memorandum to faculty members. (1961, October 27). Faculty travel policy.

Chairman's memorandum to the Staff Development Committee. (1994, August 31).

College Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Procedures. (1972). Revised promotion procedures memorandum and report.

College Budget 1965-66.

College Budget 1966-67.

College Bulletin. 1964-65.

College Catalog 1974-75.

College Catalog 1980-81.

College Catalog 1990-91.

College Catalog 1998-2000.

College Senate agenda. (1974, November 26).

College Senate Appointments Committee memorandum. (1971) Priorities for consideration in selecting an Academic Dean..

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1969, August 19).

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1971, November 18).

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1971, December 2).

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1972, January 6).

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1972, September 21).

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1972, November 21).

College Senate Executive Board minutes. (1973, May 10).

College Senate meeting minutes. (1970, October 29).

College Senate meeting minutes. (1973, September 4).

College Senate meeting minutes. (1974, May 7).

College Senate memorandum. (1971). Re: Restructuring and re-evaluation of the College Senate.

College Senate Newsletter, Vol. I, No. II. (1972, November).

College Senate Newsletter, Vol. I. No. III. (1972, December).

College Senate Newsletter, Vol. I, No. IV. (1973, March).

College Senate President memorandum to College Senate members. (1972, May 2). Re: Model Bill of Rights and Responsibilities proposed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

College Senate President memorandum to all members of the College Senate. (1972, August 1).

College Senate President memorandum to all members of the College Senate. (1972, September 26). Re: Criteria evaluation scale.

College Senate President memorandum to College Senate member. (1973, November 29). Re: Draft of new promotion, tenure and performance evaluation package.

College Senate special meeting minutes. (1970, September 3).

College Senate special meeting minutes of September 10, 1974. (1974, October 3).

Constitution of the College Senate of [the College]. (1969).

Coordinator, Faculty Professional Development, memorandum to focus group members. (1998, August 5).

Coordinator memorandum to all faculty and administrators. (1986, September 26).

DACUM-based model of faculty excellence results. (1992, Spring).

Dean's Bulletin No. 11. (1958, October 5).

Dean's Bulletin No. 5. (1959, October 5).

Dean's Bulletin No. 19. (1960, March 25).

Dean's Bulletin No. 20. (1960, April 12).

Dean's Bulletin No. 21. (1960, April 26).

Dean's Bulletin No. 2. (1960, September 28).

Dean's Bulletin No. 3. (1960, October 11).

Dean's Bulletin No. 4. (1960, October 21).

Dean's Bulletin No. 1. (1961, February 10).

Divisional Chairmen meeting minutes. (1963, October 15).

Divisional Chairmen meeting minutes. (1971, March 30).

ETC. (1990, September 24). [newsletter].

ETC. (1991, January). [newsletter].

Evaluation Report of [the College]. (1969, February 16-19). Unpublished report prepared for the Commission on Institutions for Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Evidence of Achievement of Institutional Operational Objectives. (FY86). [report].

Executive Board minutes. (1971, July 20).`

Executive Board of the Faculty Senate letter to Board of Trustees. (1967, October 17).

Executive Council of Faculty Senate minutes. (1967, October 17).

Faculty Development Committee. (1971). New faculty survey.

Faculty Development Opportunities. (1992, February 24). [brochure]

Faculty and Staff Honors Convocation Program. (October 5, 1989).

Faculty Handbook. (1976, August 16).

Faculty Handbook (1990 August).

Faculty Manual. (1964-65).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1960, September 24).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1960, December 17).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1961, March 25).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1962, March 10).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1963, October 26).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1964, January 18).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1967, May 13).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1969, February 19).

Faculty Meeting Minutes. (1969, April 30).

Faculty Organization Interim President's memorandum to all full-time faculty members. (1974, November 21). Re: Ratification of the by-laws of the Faculty Organization.

Faculty Professional Development Committee meeting minutes. (1983, November 18). [circulated among committee members only].

Faculty Professional Development Committee meeting minutes. (1994, February 3). [circulated among committee members only].

Faculty Professional Development Committee meeting minutes. (1994, April 21). [circulated among committee members only].

Faculty Professional Development Committee memorandum to all full-time faculty members. (1992, March 2). Re: Model of faculty excellence.

Faculty Professional Growth and Development Plan. (1993).

Faculty Promotion Policy. (1972, August 1).

Faculty Senate Chairman's open letter to faculty. (1968, November 25).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. I, No. 1. (1975, April 18).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. II, No 4. (1975, September 5).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. II, No. 6. (1975, October 3).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. II, No. 7. (1975, October 31).

Faculty Senate Memo. (1976, April).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol.II, No. 17. (1976, May 14).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. III, No. 1. (1976, June 19).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. VIII, No. 7. (1981, November 20).

Faculty Senate Memo Vol. XV, No. 1. (1989, September 25).

Faculty Senate memo. (1981, November 20).

Faculty Senate minutes (1968, October 5).

Faculty Senate minutes (1969, March 3).

Faculty Senate minutes (1969, April 30).

Faculty Senate president's memorandum. (1976, February 12). [encouraged faculty to support legislation to enable collective bargaining for the college.]

Faculty Senate president's memorandum to all full time faculty. (1977, August 31). Re: Progress on reduction in force policy.

Faculty Senate president's memorandum to all faculty. (1979, October 30). Re: questionnaire topics for distinguished guests.

Faculty Senate president's memorandum to all full-time faculty. (1990, March 29). Re: Leave banking program.

Faculty Senate president's memorandum to all full-time faculty. (1990, December 11). Re: emergency meeting to discuss financial crisis.

Faculty Senate president's memorandum to all faculty. (1991, February 14). Re: Board of Trustee's meeting on February 14.

Faculty/Staff Meeting Minutes. (1959, October 17).

Faculty/Staff Meeting Minutes. (1959, December 21).

Faculty Survey. (1998).

Faculty Welfare Committee meeting minutes. (1965, November 19).

Faculty Welfare Committee meeting minutes. (1965, December 3).

Faculty Welfare Committee memorandum to the Executive Board of the College Senate. (1969, October 28).

Faculty Welfare Committee memorandum to faculty. (1964, April 29).

Faculty Welfare Committee memorandum to President [#1]. (1964, November).

Faculty Welfare Committee memorandum. (1969, October 28).

Faculty Welfare Committee Chairman memorandum to all faculty. (1969, November 17).

Faculty Welfare Committee Chairman memorandum to all faculty. (1970, February 10).

Faculty Welfare Committee Chairman memorandum to President [#3]. (1966) [spring report].

Focus group results memo. (1998, August 5).

FY72 General Current Operating Budget.

FY74 General Current Operating Budget.

FY77 General Current Operating Budget.

FY84 General Current Operating Budget.

FY88 General Current Operating Budget.

FY89 General Current Operating Budget.

Guidelines . . . FY1971-72. Written directions.

Historical Development of . . . Community College. (c. 1968). Unpublished report.

Honors Convocation Program.(1989).

1971-72 Institutional Objectives. (1971, October 20).

Master Plan 1989-1994.

McManis Associates Management & Research Consultants. (1970, December). Management and Campus Development Study for PGCC. Private report in administrative files.

Middle States Visiting Team report. (1995).

Newsletter "Integrating the Scholarship on Women." (1988, January 19).

Newsletter "Integrating the Scholarship on Women." (1988, March 15).

Note (1972, May 26). [Handwritten by President #5 on a proposal.]

Note (1972, June 22). [Handwritten by President #5 on a proposal.]

Periodic Review Report. (1980, April 1). [Prepared in response to the report of the 1975 Middle States Visiting Team.]

Periodic Review Report. (1990, June). [Prepared in response to the report of the 1985 Middle States Visiting Team.]

Periodic Review Report. (2000, June). [Prepared in response to the report of the 1995 Middle States Visiting Team.]

Position Description. (1994, June 2).

President #2 Memorandum to the administrative staff, divisional chairman and head librarian. (undated, circa 1965).

President #3 Memorandum to the administrative staff (1965, September 9).

President #3 Memorandum to faculty and staff. (1966, February 7).

President #4 Memorandum. (1969, February 24). Verbal report of the recommendations of the visitation team from the Middle States Association made on February 19, 1969. Unpublished

President #5 letter to "Faculty Member." (1971, August 13).

President #5 Institutional Objectives. (1971, October 20).

President #5 Memorandum to College Senate President. (1972, January 19). Re: Position paper and faculty evaluation.

President #5 Memorandum. (1972, November 15). Re: Resignation.

President #6 Memorandum to chairman of Educational Progress Grant Program Review Committee. (1972, December 11).

President #6 Memorandum to all cost center managers. (1973, March 15).

Presidential Bulletin No. 3. (1965, February 11).

Presidential Bulletin No. 4. (1965, February 24).

Presidential Bulletin No. 5. (1965, March 29).

Presidential Bulletin No. 9. (1965, May 26).

President's Annual Report. (1960-61).

President's Annual Report. (1965-1966).

President's Annual Report. (1971-72).

President's Bulletin No. 6. (1961, October 30).

President's Bulletin 7-65. (1965, October 29).

President's Bulletin 1-66. (1966, September 30).

President's Memorandum. (1965, September 9).

President's Memorandum. (1965, undated).

President's Memorandum. (1966, February 7).

President's Memorandum (1966, February 23).

President's Memorandum. (1966, May 23).

President's Memorandum. (1967, May 24).

President's Memorandum. (1967, November 13).

President's Memorandum (1968, January 18).

President's Report. (1966-67).

President's Report. (1971-72).

Professional Development Committee memorandum to all faculty, administrators and counselors. (undated). Re: New-Faculty Survey (Core unit for January 29, 1971 Colloquium).

Professional Development Committee memorandum to Members of Executive Board. (1971, November, 18). Re: Changes 1971-72.

Professional Development Committee resolution to the Faculty Senate. (1998, May 5). [resolution advocated for a professional development coordinator and college-wide professional development.]

Proposed Faculty Welfare Package. (1972, February 22).

Ramplin, M.E. (1984). Oral History of the Founding of [the College]. Unpublished manuscript for a history class project at Bowie State College, MD.

Reflections on the History of the College Senate (1971, April 21). Unpublished report.

Report on Staff Development: Present and Future. (1995, April 17).

Results of the Referendum Vote memorandum. (1969).

Ryan, M. (1987, August). Faculty Development at [the College]: Present Activities/Future Needs. Report RB88-2. Largo, MD: Office of Research and Development.

Second Annual Report 1959-1960.

Self Evaluation Report. (1963).

Self Evaluation Report. (1968, October). "Compiled by the Faculty for the consideration of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education the Middle States Associations of Colleges and Secondary Schools."

Self Study Report. (1975, February). Unpublished report in preparation for the visit of the Middle States Visiting Team.

Self Study Report. (1985, March). Unpublished report in preparation for the visit of the Middle States Visiting Team.

Student Government Association vice president's memo to student members of the College Senate and committee chairmen. (1971, October).

Survey Results. (1998). Unpublished report.

Thank you letter. (1971, June 25).

Trustee Topics. (1970, April 21). [Board of Trustee's newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1970, May 12). [Board of Trustee's newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1970, May 25). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1970, June 15). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1970, July 13). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1970, December 1). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1972, May 8). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1972, June 20). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1973, April 10). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1974, September 24). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1974, October 22). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Trustee Topics. (1974, December 17). [Board of Trustees' newsletter.]

Unofficial Middle States Association Visiting Team Report. (1963, April 29-May 2). Unpublished report to the College.

Vice President for Instruction memorandum to all faculty (1992, February 24).

Vice President for Instruction memorandum to all faculty. (1998, April 17).

Vice President, Student Government Association memorandum to student members of the College Senate and Committee Chairman. (1971, October).

Visiting Team Report. (1995).

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (1994). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Angel, D., & DeVault, M. (Eds.). (1991). Conceptualizing 2000: Proactive planning. Community College Press: Washington, DC.

Angelo, T. A. (1994, June). From faculty development to academic development. AAHE Bulletin, 3-7.

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Annotated Code of the Public General Laws of Maryland: Education. (1989). Charlottesville, VA: The Michie Company.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1977/1979). A handbook for faculty development (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1981). A handbook for faculty development (Vol. 3). Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Chickering, A.W. & Associates. (1981). The modern American college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chronister, J. L. (1970). In-service training for two-year college faculty and staff: The role of the graduate institutions (Occasional Paper 2). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia, School of Education.

Clinton, W. (1997, February 5). State of the union address. Retrieved October 22, 1998, from the World Wide Web: http://www.ed.gov/updates/PresEDPlan/part1.html

Clinton, W. (1997, July 1). President Clinton's tax cut proposal: A fact sheet. Retrieved October 22, 1998, from the World Wide Web: http://www.ed.gov/updates/facts.html

Clinton, W. (1998, June 17). President Clinton announces new 21st century community learning centers [press release]. Retrieved October 22, 1998, from the World Wide Web: http://www.ed.gov/Press Releases/06-1998/21grnt1.html

Clough, C. E. (1991, February). Improving staff development in South County Community College District, California. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American Community College (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Commission on Higher Education Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. (1994). Characteristics of excellence in higher education: Standards for accreditation. Philadelphia: Author.

Committee on the Future of Maryland Community Colleges. (1985). Blueprint for quality. Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Board for Community College Education.

ED Initiatives . . . . (1998, October 9). Retrieved October 9, 1998, from the World Wide Web: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/EDInitiations/98/98-10-09.html

Engleberg, I. N. (1991, Winter) Needs assessment: The first step in staff development. The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 9(4), 215-222.

Felton, M., Hilgemann, V., & Whitton, L. (1996, May). Building connections by opening classroom doors: An interdisciplinary internship approach to faculty development. Paper presented at the International Conference on Teaching and Leadership Excellence in Austin, Texas.

Fideler, E. F. (1991, Winter). Inquiry-based faculty development. The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 9(4), 197-203.

Florida State Board of Community Colleges. (1987). Personnel Responsibilities: Issues and Perspectives. Trustee Monograph Series.

Focus on Access, Community, and Excellence in Teaching Commission. (1990, April). The FACET report toward 2001: An odyssey of excellence. St. Petersburg, FL: St. Petersburg Junior College.

Freedman, M. (with Brown, W., Ralph, N., Shukraft, R., Bloom, M., & Sanford, N.). (1979). Academic culture and faculty development. Berkeley, CA: Montaigne Press, Inc.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Giroux, R. (1989, March). A blueprint for human resource development in the third decade of the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Executive Summary for the Committee of the Presidents.

Guskin, A. E. (1994, July/August). Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning: The university challenge of the 1990s, Part I: restructuring the administration. Change, 23-29.

Guskin, A. E. (1994, September/October). Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning: The university challenge of the 1990s, Part II: restructuring the role of faculty. Change, 16-25.

Harnish, D. (1986). Focus on faculty: A report on professional development at Niagara County Community College 1985-86. Sanborn, NY: Niagara Community College.

Heelan, C. M. (1980, Winter). A program of staff development (a proposed model) for credit-free instructors. Minneapolis: North Hennepin Community College.

Henderson, J., Neibling, J., & Degner, A. (1996, November). Bits, bytes, and bricks...: The impact of technology on classroom architecture. Paper presented at the League for Innovation Conference, Phoenix, AZ. Farmington, NM: San Juan College.

Hockaday, J., & Puyear, D. (1987, April). The Virginia community college comes of age. University of Virginia Institute of Government Newsletter, 63(8), 1.

Hoerner, J. L., Clowes, D. A., Lichtman, M. V., & Allkins, M. T. (1991, August). Professional development programs, leadership, and institutional culture: Lessons from a study of professional development programs for community college occupational-technical faculty. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Educational.

Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (Eds.). (1994) Informing faculty development for teacher educators. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Johnson County Community College. (1996, August). Staff development directory. Overland Park, KS: Author.

Katz, J., Bornholdt, L., Gaff, J. G., Hoffman, N., Newman, L. F., & Ratner, M. (1988). A new vitality in general education planning, teaching, and supporting effective liberal learning by the Task Group on General Education. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Katz, J., & Henry, M. (1988). Turning Professors into teachers: A new approach to faculty development and student learning. New York: American Council on Education Macmillan Publishing Co.

London, H. B. (1989). In between: The community college teacher. In Ratcliff, J. (Ed.), ASHE reader on community colleges (pp. 247-253). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1995). Designing qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Maryland Association of Community Colleges. (2000). Report. Retrieved September 24, 2000, from the World Wide Web: http://www.cat.cc.md.us/macc

Maryland State Board for Community Colleges. (1973, October). Statewide master plan for community colleges in Maryland 1973-1983. Annapolis, MD: Author.

McCright, G. J. (1983, July, 28). A study of perceived professional development needs of part-time faculty members at Marshalltown Community College. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Virginia Community College, VA.

Menges, R. J., & Mathis, C. B. (1988). Key resources on teaching, learning, curriculum, and faculty development: A guide to the higher education literature. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, D. J., & Ratcliff, J. L. (1986). Analysis of professional development activities of Iowa community college faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 10, 317-343.

Miller, R. I. (Ed.). (1988). Evaluating major components of two-year colleges. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.

Miller, W. S., & Wilson, K. M. (1963). Faculty development procedures in small colleges/a southern survey. SREB Research Monograph No. 5. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Monoson, P. K., & Batsche, C. N. (1992, May). A four-phase multidisciplinary faculty development model in aging, Volume I: Final report. (CFDA No. 13-668 award number 90AT0458/01. Normal, IL: Illinois State University.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (1998). Malcolm Baldrige national quality award: 1998 criteria for performance excellence. Retrieved May 12, 1998, from the World Wide Web: http://www.quality.nist.gov/docs/98

National Council for Staff Program and Organizational Development (1994). Conference paper part II. 12 step program to success in staff development. 8-18. Conference handout.

Needles, B. E. Jr., Anderson, H. R., & Caldwell, J.C. (1984). Principles of accounting (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Nickel, D. (1986, Spring). Effects of a staff development center. Journal of Staff, Program & Organization Development, 4(1), 13-15.

O'Banion, T. (1972). Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community-junior college. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.

O'Banion, T. (1981). Community college staff development programs for the 80's. Frederick, MD: Associated Faculty Press, Inc.

Oromaner, M. (1994, June). Putting the staff in staff development. Paper prepared for the Eighth Annual conference of Library Assistants. Jersey City, NJ: Hudson County Community College.

Richardson, R. & Moore, W. (1987). Faculty development and evaluation in Texas community colleges. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 11, 19-32.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1995). Part-time faculty in American community colleges. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Roueche, S. D., & Roueche J. E. (1993, April/May). Making good on the promise. AACC Journal, 18-23.

Sablan, H. (1996, February). A faculty-driven teaching & learning center: The evolution of a profession development venture. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chairs, Deans and Other Organizational Leaders Academy. 173-178.

Schuster, J. H., Wheeler, D. W. & Associates. (1990). Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shawl, W. F. (1984). Institutionalizing staff development. Unpublished manuscript, Golden West College, CA.

Singer, D. S. (1969). In-service training for two-year college faculty and staff: A survey of junior and community college administrators. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Smith, R., & Schwartz, F. (1986, spring). A theory of effectiveness: Faculty development case studies. Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 4(1), 3-8.

Soffen, J. (1967). Faculty development in professional education: Problems of, and proposals for recruitment, pre-service, induction and continuing development in social work education. New York: Council on Social Work Education.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1986, Spring). Career goals of faculty: Future trends & directions. Journal of Staff, Program & Organization Development, 4(1), 9-12.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Texas Consortium of Geriatric Education Centers. (1992, August 31). A statewide faculty development program for community college associate degree and other nursing educators. Final Report. Administration on Aging Grant No. DHHS 90AT0463/01. Houston: Baylor College of Medicine.

Thompson, D. (1995, May). Alternative approaches to adjunct faculty development. 1994-95 Mid-Career Fellowship Project Report. Lincroft, NJ: Princeton University.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). Discussion: State of Texas community colleges. Retrieved October 22, 1998, from the World Wide Web: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OVAE/CCLO/texas.html

Valek, M. (1986, Winter). Faculty renewal: Strategies for vitality. Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 4(4), 93-98.

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). The community college presidency. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989). The community college in America: the Origins. In Ratcliff, J. (Ed.), ASHE reader on community colleges, (pp. 15-29). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Witt, A. A., Wattenbarger, J. L., Gollattscheck, J. F., & Suppiger, J. E. (1995). America's community colleges: The first century. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage Publications.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Community College Faculty Professional Development: Perspective in Time

Author(s): Verna Teasdale

Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2001

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☒	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Verna Teasdale	Printed Name/Position/Title: Verna Teasdale	
Organization/Address: 12100 Maycheck Lane Bowie, MD 20715	Telephone: 301/262-9128	FAX: 301/262-6720
	E-Mail Address: rep@erols.com	Date: 7/7/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Eric Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
3051 Moore Hall / UCLA
Box 951521
Los angeles, CA 90095-1521

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**~~
~~4483-A Forbes Boulevard~~
~~Lanham, Maryland 20706~~

~~Telephone: 301-552-4200~~
~~Toll Free: 800-799-3742~~
~~FAX: 301-552-4700~~
~~e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov~~
~~WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com~~